

## SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1958

Rev. Edwin S. Hunt, minister, Covenant Methodist Church, Evanston, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou who art ever first to the meeting place when we attune the sanctuary of our innermost being with that which is unchanging and absolute, good, true, lovely, pure, and of good report, reveal Thyself to us in this hour as the God who watches over all of our ways and gives us the directions for our pilgrimage of life.

As we pause in these sacred moments, our prayer is that all may feel the high challenge of these times of exciting change. Grant us the strength of spirit to accept the plateau of tension of our age with the enthusiasm of our individualistic forefathers; chide us when our sight of Thee and Thy goals for us is blighted by a township mind of parochial partisanships and patronage; bless us when our spirits overflow with the God-conceived concepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the bodies, minds, and souls of humankind everywhere.

Bring close Thy soul to the soul of our President, the assembled bodies of our Nation's leaders, and all our people. Make all of us aware of our responsibility to and our dependence upon each other, but, most of all, of our one great dependence upon Thee, for it is in Thy name that we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 31, 1958, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3051) to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HALEY, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DAWSON of Utah, and Mr. WESTLAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8826) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1956, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12140) to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other reasons.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 985) to provide that chief judges of circuit courts and chief judges of district courts having three or more judges shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit in executive session during the session of the Senate today. I understand the committee is considering the school scholarship bill. We are very hopeful the bill can be reported, and we can get action on it before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to that also.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the eulogies of the late Senator Neely and the late Senator Scott, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 2029, House bill 8381, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to make certain corrections and technical amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the Secretary will state the nomination on the calendar.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the President saw fit to renominate Mr. Hutchinson. He is a very able lawyer, and is highly regarded throughout our State of Texas. He has a judicial temperament. He is a very conscientious and dedicated public servant; and, I repeat, I am pleased, as is my junior colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH], to have the opportunity to vote to confirm this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate endorse and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of this confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 10277. An act to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper (Rept. No. 2092).

## FURTHER AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2091)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 4162) to further amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 4215. A bill to preserve Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church national historic site by authorizing the acquisition of abutting properties, and for other purposes; and

S. 4216. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), as amended, providing for the establishment of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 4217. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gewinner; and

S. 4218. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Kitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 4219. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 4220. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 4221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita McDowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 4222. A bill for the relief of John A. Skenandore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 4223. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 4224. A bill to require the filing of evidentiary briefs by the United States in connection with the entry of consent decrees, judgments, and orders in civil antitrust actions; and

S. 4225. A bill to authorize the recovery of actual costs reasonably incurred by plaintiffs in private actions for injunctive relief from antitrust violations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 4226. A bill to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Table Rock Reservoir for the purpose of water supply for a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### ANNUAL REPORTS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CONCERNING STRENGTH AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference, which reads as follows:

Whereas the cost of defense is yearly mounting to unprecedented totals, constituting by far the major portion of the national budget and requiring raising the Federal debt limit to a size increasingly burdensome to our citizens and dangerous to our economy; and

Whereas the perfectly natural anxieties of our military leaders and the constantly increasing complexity and cost of our weapons systems are forever multiplying military expenditures, theoretically limited only by the ultimate conditions of the garrison state; and

Whereas the Congress shares with the administrative branch of the Government responsibility for the national defense; and

Whereas the situation critically demands a legislative review of the overall program of national defense to carry out these responsibilities properly; and

Whereas such a program is not now presented to the appropriate committees of the Congress, namely the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, but only to the Appropriations Committees of those Houses as line-by-line appropriation requests, in such form and at such a time as to make impossible the determination of an overall defense policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that in order to establish procedures for better informing the Armed Services Committees of the Congress concerning the strength and organization of the Department of Defense that the Secretary of Defense should present to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report explaining the strength and organization planned by the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year.

This report should include but should not be limited to presentations explaining personnel strengths for the active and reserve components of the military services, materiel procurement, maintenance plans, research and development activities and the authorizations for military construction.

The above report should be presented within 30 days of the opening date of each session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 110) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PROMOTION OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN INTEGRITY OF CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to improve the public service. This bill is the result of much concern and several years of thought on how best to maintain high standards in both Congress and in the executive branch of Government.

The bill has four major provisions:

First. The requirement that Members of Congress and all employees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government earning in excess of \$12,500 a year and candidates for Federal office file an annual report of income, including reimbursement for any expenditure, gifts in excess of \$100 in amount or value, fees or honorariums for speeches or articles, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by an individual in kind; all dealings in securities, commodities, or real property during the year. These reports would be filed with the Comptroller General and would be open to the press and the public.

Second. The requirement that all communications, whether written or

oral, including those from Congress and the executive branch, with respect to any case pending before a Federal agency be made a part of the public record of such case.

Third. A requirement that committees of the Senate and the House file annually itemized expense accounts for all travel, subsistence, or accommodations used by members of such committees or staff members. The reports shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Fourth. The establishment of a Commission on Legislative Standards to conduct a study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive agencies which confront Members of Congress, with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems. This would include such problems as that of disqualification of particular votes, and the often difficult determination of the line between adequate representation of constituent interest and attempted influence.

The key section of this bill is the first one. The requirement for disclosure of gifts and fees received by Members of Congress or Federal employees will serve as a brake on both those who would influence and those who would be influenced. When an individual realizes a gift will be a matter of public record, he is likely to give additional consideration to the propriety of the gift. The principle involved is similar to that employed in the Federal Lobbying Act and the proposed Federal Elections Act.

The mere existence of such a report will make it easier for the legislator and the policymaker to reject such gifts.

This bill would apply to all persons in the upper grades who are likely to be in a position to make or influence policy in the executive branch. It would also apply to persons at equivalent levels in the services and in the legislative branch. In fairness to incumbent Members of Congress, it would also include candidates for Congress. It is possible that the scope of this bill is too large. I feel it is better to err on the side of inclusion, rather than permit any important class of officials to be exempted. If experience indicates the need for amendments, they can be made.

Respect for privacy is deeply ingrained in Americans. I value it highly myself. But, reluctantly, I have concluded that in this instance an overriding public interest makes necessary the disclosure of information for which my bill would provide. Action is necessary, and I am convinced that it would be far more effective to turn the spotlight of publicity on all gifts and favors than to attempt to draw a line between those which are proper and improper. My bill would require public officials to exercise their own judgment in acceptance of favors and then would give the public the chance to decide whether the judgment exercised was sound.

I realize that legislative proposals such as this one and similar proposals and proposals having similar objectives



by Senators DOUGLAS, NEUBERGER, IVES, JAVITS, CLARK, and others, are not rushed to early enactment. Yet their introduction does serve a useful purpose. Inevitably they focus attention upon the difficult problems which exist in this area and help to arouse public interest with eventual beneficial effects.

The bill itself is, of course, far from perfect. It will not plug all the gaps. But it could be a start. Disclosure can help to dispel the cynical view of politics and public service that has made "politician" almost a dirty word among far too many people. You and I know that most public servants do not take graft and do not respond to improper pressure. Rather, most of them are trying conscientiously to serve the public interest as best they can whether they be in the executive or the legislative branch.

Through legislation such as this we can help to correct the distorted image of public officials that now exists in many quarters and thereby encourage the ablest and best in our communities to continue to seek public office in both appointive and elective capacities.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the bill in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4223) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner), each civil or military officer and each employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$12,500 per annum shall file annually, and each individual who is a candidate of a political party in a general election for the office of Senator or Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives but who, at the time he becomes a candidate does not occupy any such office, shall file within 1 month after he is so selected or so becomes, with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) The amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by him or by him and his spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds \$100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by any individual for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by any individual in kind;

(2) The value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, and the

amount of each liability owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of the close of the preceding calendar year;

(3) All dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year;

(4) All purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year.

(b) Except as hereinbefore provided, reports required by this section (other than reports so required by candidates of political parties) shall be filed not later than April 30 of each year. In the case of any person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than 3 months after such last day, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, where separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealings in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

(d) Each report required by this section shall be made under penalty for perjury. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined \$2,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller General as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual shall be considered to have been a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Delegate or Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof, during any calendar year if he served in any such position for more than 6 months during such calendar year.

(g) As used in this section—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U. S. C., sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (title 5, U. S. C., sec. 1004) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Communications to agency: All written communications and memorandums stating the circumstances, source, and substance of all oral communications made to the agency, or any officer or employee thereof, with respect to such case by any person who is not an officer or employee of the agency

shall be made a part of the public record of such case. This subsection shall not apply to communications to any officer, employee, or agent of the agency engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the agency with respect to such case."

SEC. 3. Each standing and select committee of the Senate and each joint committee the funds of which are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall report to the Secretary of the Senate, and each standing and select committee of the House of Representatives and each joint committee the funds of which are disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall report to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 days after June 30 and December 31 of each year, beginning with the year 1959, the name of each member or employee of such committee or any subcommittee thereof who, during the preceding 6-month period, has engaged in official travel for such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, at public expense. Such report shall particularize each item of expense incurred by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, with respect to the travel of each such member or employee and shall include the value of any transportation, subsistence, or accommodations provided such member or employee, while on such official travel, by any department or agency of the Government, including the dollar equivalent of any amounts made available to or expended on behalf of such member or employee from foreign currencies owned by the United States. The committee or subcommittee concerned shall reimburse any department or agency of the Government for any transportation, subsistence, or accommodations provided any member or employee of such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, by such department or agency while such member or employee is engaged in official travel for such committee or subcommittee. The reports provided for by this section shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon after such reports are made as is practicable.

SEC. 4. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission to be known as the "Commission on Legislative Standards" (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) which shall be composed of 4 members to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and 4 members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) The members shall be citizens of the United States (A) who are interested in good government and who by reason of professional training and experience are peculiarly qualified to carry out the duties of the Commission, and (B) who hold no elective or party office or position.

(3) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members and shall establish rules for its procedure.

(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) The members of the Commission shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to

reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

(d) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive agencies which confront Members of Congress with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems.

(e) (1) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof may, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the Chairman of any such subcommittee (with the approval of a majority of the members thereof), and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman of the Commission or the Chairman of any such subcommittee. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(2) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(3) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, independent instrumentality of the Government, or congressional committee any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

(f) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities and the results of its studies and investigations, together with such legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than January 30, 1960, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist.

(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend my friend the Senator from New Jersey for the introduction of his bill and for the excellent statement he has made in support of it, and to express the hope that his bill, together with the one the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I offered, and the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will have a better fate in the 86th Congress than they are obviously going to have in the 85th Congress. I hope that when we come back next January the memory of Sherman Adams and Goldfine will continue to press us to enact this type of legislation, which was needed a long time before this particular incident caught the public imagination. I thank my friend for yielding to me and

to commend him for his activity in this field.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have known of his deep interest in this activity. As he suggests, the problem we confront is not of one day or of recent times, or one which can be easily disposed of. It is one which requires and will always require a continuing effort. That is the purpose of the bills which I and my other colleagues who have been active in this field have introduced.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are still in the morning hour; therefore, I shall speak only briefly on the bill introduced by the able Senator from New Jersey. I am pleased that he has presented the bill, if for no other reason than that it will bring about better information, better education, and better enlightenment in this vital field and will thus help bring about beneficial results. I hope that his bill, or perhaps the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself, or a combination of them, will be enacted. The mere presentation of such proposed legislation helps to do a great deal of good.

I wish to add just an additional thought to the very clear and concise statement made by the Senator from New Jersey. In addition to providing ethical standards for officials of Government, I believe we must accompany such efforts with some legislation which will limit, or control, the huge campaign funds which those officials need to be elected to public office. I believe the two things must go hand in hand; ethical standards to be observed by public officials, and some control over campaign expenditures, so that they may become better public officials. I believe they are the twin goals we must seek. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I particularly wish to emphasize his contributions, which have been both nonpartisan and of great aid toward understanding the problem. I wish also to commend him for his writings in magazines and other media of communication, which have been enormously helpful. I realize that the area with which my bill deals and with which bills introduced by other Senators deal relate to only one part of the problem, and that they are closely related to the area involving the matter of campaign contributions to political parties and to individuals. That is why I emphasized in my remarks earlier that I regard as a companion measure the bill to revise the Federal elections law which the Committee on Rules and Administration reported last year. I thank the Senator.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARRETT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him,

to the bill (S. 932) to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice; to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners; to provide for admission to and control of practice; to establish a Legal Career Service for improvement of legal services in Government; and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE TAX REVISION FOR SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 13382) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide tax revision for small business, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

#### PROGRAM OF SURVIVAL DEPOTS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, with the knowledge and consent of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 4055) to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), on June 25, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CORRECTION OF REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate on yesterday received two bills passed on the previous day by the House of Representatives, namely, H. R. 12728 and H. R. 13021, both amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

H. R. 12728 was shown in the House Calendar as a companion bill of S. 3486 reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on July 1, 1958, which amended the act in respect to safety rules, and the House bill, under the practice, was placed on the calendar. However, the House bill amends the act with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

H. R. 13021 is the corresponding bill to S. 3486.

In order to correct the situation, I ask that H. R. 12728 be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 13021, and that it be placed on the calendar with a cross reference to Senate bill 3486, Calendar No. 1823.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.



# AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT TO FILE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on yesterday, July 31, the Special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, under authority of Senate Resolution 241, expired. As we know, the work of that subcommittee has now been taken over by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I had intended yesterday to ask unanimous consent for permission to file a report, but the Senate adjourned before I could do so. Therefore, today I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under authority of Senate Resolution 241, agreed to January 29, 1958, have permission to file a final report with necessary illustrations during the second session or adjourned periods of the 85th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article entitled "Turning Point for Disarmament," written by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and published in the Progressive magazine for August 1958.

## PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], together with an attachment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and attachment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

On July 29, 1958, the junior Senator from Massachusetts and I engaged in an amicable colloquy with reference to the so-called Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill. Just prior to my questioning of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, he alleged that the Kennedy-Ives bill was dead as the result of unscrupulous lobbying by representatives of business in the United States. He specifically called the attention of the Senate, as well as the country at large, to a Labor Gram issued by the American Retail Federation and characterized this particular issue of the Labor Gram as misleading junk.

I stated on the floor at that time that I felt the junior Senator from Massachusetts whole thesis about the alleged demise of the Kennedy-Ives bill was fallacious but I do not care to carry that any further at this time. I do feel, however, in fairness to the American Retail Federation that their side of the story should be taken into consideration.

I am attaching herewith, therefore, the July 30 memorandum of the American Retail Federation concerning Senator KENNEDY's speech. From a perusal of this memorandum it will be noted that the Labor Gram from which Senator KENNEDY quoted in his speech had nothing whatsoever to do

with the Kennedy-Ives bill, but was a discussion of the recently announced NLRB jurisdictional standards.

I think it only fair that this matter be brought to the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, so he can correct his original statement.

THE NATIONAL ACTION TEAM  
FOR RETAILING,  
July 30, 1958.

### To All Members:

Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, on the floor of the United States Senate made charges to the effect that a group of trade associations including the American Retail Federation operated as a secret government and holds up vital labor legislation needed by the public. This we categorically deny.

We also take exception with the Senator from Massachusetts when he refers to the ARF Labor Gram as misleading junk. We respectfully suggest to the Senator that he read the article from the Labor Gram from which he partially quoted on page 15425 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29. The Senator quotes the July 23 issue of the Labor Gram as indicating that the Kennedy-Ives bill would enlarge the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board so as to cover more retailers. This is not true, he says. We agree because, as a matter of fact, the article from which the Senator's quote is taken is entitled "NLRB Jurisdictional Standards." The article was discussing the effect on retailers of the NLRB's recently announced policy to enlarge its own jurisdictional standards and take jurisdiction over more retailers. The article did not mention the Kennedy-Ives bill, nor did it purport to do so. In our opinion, it is misleading for anyone to take an excerpt from an article discussing an action in which the NLRB decides to take jurisdiction over more retailers and apply these comments as interpreting the meaning of a bill being considered by Congress.

The American Retail Federation, acting through its duly constituted employee relations committee reached unanimous agreement that certain provisions of the Kennedy-Ives labor bill would raise havoc with a retailer's freedom to maintain a good personnel program. Immediately after the Senate passed the bill—S. 3974—we wrote to the House Labor Committee and asked for time to testify on the bill and discuss these sections—103 and 607.

When it became apparent that certain Congressional leaders intended to bypass the Labor Committee and pass the bill without holding public hearings on it, we took the only course left to us and told Main Street retailers what was being done.

It was these retailers who recognized the seriousness of the situation. We are proud to say that they responded to ARF's alert in a manner which is a tribute to their sincere desire to protect their employees.

Retailers are traditionally an independent group of persons and no trade association can make them write to their Congressmen if they do not believe that which they write.

ARF made its own evaluation of the situation and policy-wise acted independent of the wishes of either the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce. It just so happens that their opinion of the bill agreed with ours.

The American Retail Federation never has—and never will—condemn honest efforts at labor reforms. Nor do we favor an all-or-nothing policy. However, we do believe that Congress must follow the time tested legislative process and not pass a labor bill without first finding out what each and every line of it means.

ROWLAND JONES, Jr.

# JAMES L. McDEVITT, OF THE AFL-CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the labor bosses are primed and ready to flood the American political arteries with over \$3 million, and to dispatch a vast army of politically trained men and women into the field, in the coming primary and general election campaigns.

The labor bosses are training their big guns on the months ahead for a definite reason: They want to elect to the 86th Congress a substantial majority of Representatives and Senators who will do their bidding, and they want to return to the White House, in 1960, an administration which will be subservient to their wishes—as the Roosevelt and Truman administrations were, from 1932 to 1952.

The labor bosses want this total control over Government, so they can force enactment of the economic, business, and labor legislation which will strengthen their hold on the rank-and-file laboring man, and will bring business and industry to their knees before the consolidated power of the monopoly which the labor bosses control.

The labor bosses want to have enacted legislation which will throw a roadblock in front of the Nation's courts—which defend the rights of the rank-and-file workers, and may hand down decisions restraining wholesale political activities by the labor bosses.

The labor bosses want this undisputed control over the functions of government, in order to promote the socialistic and welfare-state policies to which they have been committed of late—since the welfare and working conditions of their individual members have ceased to be their primary concern.

James L. McDevitt, codirector of the AFL-CIO committee on political education, is the one man to whom the labor bosses have entrusted the tremendous task of spending over \$3 million, as well as guiding the actions of thousands of political workers in the coming months.

What are Mr. McDevitt's qualifications?

One way to answer this question is to review, briefly, the tactics of other labor bosses when they have been required to answer for their activities before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

I have spent months, as a member of this committee, listening to the testimony of the labor bosses. It has been established in testimony that violence and flagrant violation of the law, as well as threats, intimidation, and character assassination, have highlighted the activities of some unions in the immediate past. When an attempt has been made to fix the responsibility for these blots on our national life, the labor bosses have wrung their hands in righteous indignation; they have pleaded total innocence; they have attempted to shift the blame to the rank-and-file membership.

In 9 cases out of 10—at least, in the UAW hearings—all the circumstantial evidence concerning the excesses and

transgressions of the labor unions points directly to the labor bosses. However, when they have come before our committee these union bosses have disclaimed any knowledge or responsibility for these excesses and transgressions, and have left the rank-and-file union members holding the bag.

Mr. McDevitt was before our committee on May 6. He, too, played the part of a completely innocent man who had been wronged by his associates. Perhaps Mr. McDevitt was innocent. But I, personally, cannot understand how a man charged with the responsibility of expending over \$3 million, and serving as commander in chief of the greatest political army ever assembled in this country, could be so naive.

The picture developed this way:

In 1946, when he was President of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, McDevitt hired a Mr. Lapensohn to secure, on behalf of the federation, advertisements for its yearbooks. Lapensohn continued in this operation until 1953. During this time, it turned out, he and his associates were "shaking down" employers to the tune of thousands of dollars—promising them labor peace if they advertised in the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor Yearbook. This "shakedown" operation was conducted through personal contacts and letters allegedly signed by McDevitt.

The details of this swindle, which was being perpetrated in the name of the organization McDevitt headed, were made known to a House committee in 1947. Two of Lapensohn's associates were ultimately indicted, but Lapensohn's contract was renewed year after year until 1953. Eventually he fled the jurisdiction; and the law has not been able to make him pay for his racket.

McDevitt claimed a hazy memory about all this. He testified that the hundreds of letters bearing his signature were sent out without his knowledge; but he did admit that when the strange activities of Lapensohn were being freely discussed in Congress and in the newspapers, the only action he took, as President of the Federation, was to refer the matter to the Federation's counsel. "It was a legal matter," he said, and he "didn't feel qualified" to pass on it himself.

I submit that a man who admittedly is not qualified to recognize a swindle when it is being perpetrated by one of his own lieutenants, and who admittedly is not qualified to take remedial action against that man, is not qualified to pick and choose the Senators and Representatives for whom organized labor will be expected to vote. I hope the individual members of our great labor unions will exercise their own good judgment in the months ahead, and will refuse to permit such men as McDevitt to dictate their choice of political candidates.

#### WHY ARE WE PUNISHING THE SCHOOLCHILDREN OF EGYPT?—VII

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we now come to the ugliest incident in the otherwise creditable history of our coun-

try. It is to our credit that we were providing from our great surplus nearly 1½ million pounds of butter, oil, powdered milk, and cheese per week for Egyptian schoolchildren. That flow of relief was stopped. Only in January of this year was the deplorable situation in Port Said recognized by the sending of 10,000 22-pound packages. The program should be reinstated as proposed by the second "whereas" of my resolution of July 18, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106.

Of all the poverty-stricken peoples of the world, none are more miserable than the Egyptian peasants of the Nile Valley. Nowhere on the earth's surface could the bounty of our overflowing harvests be more graciously distributed than to the undernourished children of that unfortunate population.

It was the idea of Nasser, the ruler of these people, that the building of a high dam at Aswan would store enough water to regularize and distribute a much greater flow, and produce far greater food crops than the valley had ever borne, even in the "Seven Years of Plenty." Negotiations had proceeded to the point where the World Bank was prepared to loan \$200 million, and our Government and that of Great Britain, by various means, a similar sum. The remainder of \$1,200,000,000 was to be furnished by Egyptian labor.

The history of the negotiations and the calamitous disruption of them can be read in the well documented book, *Will the Middle East Go West?* by Freda Utey. It is her theme that by ignorance and clumsiness we are losing the Arab world to the Communists, even as we lost China by the same mistaken attitudes.

The Egyptian Ambassador called at our State Department in July, 2 years ago, to accept the terms which had been agreed upon. The offer was withdrawn and the door slammed in his face.

There was no new incident. The 7-month-old Czech arms deal was well known, even if regrettable. There is no explanation of the insult to Nasser except that he was inconvenient and that we thought he could be discredited and destroyed.

So, we tried to discredit, among his own people, the man who was trying to get more food for them. To cap this brutal maneuver we cut off the CARE packages. That was 2 years ago. Food still pours into our storage bins. But it does not go on its old errand of mercy to underfed Egyptian children. By some tortured and perverted reasoning we are still trying to punish Nasser, and think this is a good way to do it.

There has been another regrettable effect of the State Department embargo on surplus food. CARE was recognized as a private organization by the Arabs. It was a people to people contact. This was most valuable. When our Government closed it off, it took on the status of an official organization and lost its favorable position in the public mind.

Mr. President, what committee, what official of our State Department is responsible for this brutal stupidity? Let him or them emerge from the teeming rabbit warren on 21st Street NW. Let

him or them stand forth and justify these acts before the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to Senator's comments relating to the cessation of the flow of food under the CARE program to Egypt. As the Senator knows, this was a matter about which I was deeply concerned and about which I expressed my concern to the Senate after a visit to Cairo, and after having talked to the CARE officials and Mr. Devine, the CARE representative in Cairo.

I expressed my concern in a report to the Senate and I urged the State Department to reinstate the CARE program. The food was available. The CARE program had operated very successfully. The Government of Egypt had cooperated wholeheartedly. In fact, the President of Egypt, Mr. Nasser, had appeared on television and radio programs with Mr. Devine of the CARE program thanking the people of the United States and thanking the CARE program for the assistance which had been given.

I spoke to the President of the United States about this matter on the occasion of my visit with him, since he was kind enough to grant me an opportunity to talk with him. I have talked with the Secretary of State about the matter.

Like the Senator from Vermont, I cannot understand why this program was stopped. I cannot understand why the program continues to be blocked, and I have never been able to ascertain who really blocked it.

I thank the Senator for saying what he has said. This is organized stupidity.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think the Senator has used an excellent phrase, "organized stupidity."

#### THE NEED FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, yesterday was a bright and happy day for millions of American old people. By a smashing 375-to-2 vote, the House of Representatives passed a bill which will increase social security benefits. Throughout America our old people firmly expect that the Senate of the United States will live up to its responsibility with a generous heart and spirit and mind. I earnestly hope so. Mr. President, to be bluntly realistic, there are roadblocks, serious roadblocks, standing in the way of the fond goal of our senior citizens. The decision, the responsibility, is up to the Senate of the United States. I plead with my fellow Senators that in the name of humanity we act.

Mr. President, the minimum payments for a woman who retires at 62 are as little as \$24 a month. It is not humanly possible to live in anything but abject poverty on about 80 cents a day.

To compound this tragedy, prices continue to go higher and higher, despite the depression. Social-security payments obviously do not reflect the higher wages of the present time; they are



based on earnings during an earlier period, when wage levels were lower and when prices were lower, too.

Mr. President, the victims of our neglect to modernize social security are the very same people who built the great productive capacity of this Nation. Their labor in our factories and farms made possible the wealth and power America enjoys today. And now, because of a faulty and inequitable distribution of this wealth, many of these same people go hungry while our warehouses brim full with surplus grains and milk and butter.

Millions of Americans live on pitifully inadequate social security benefits today because, through no fault of their own, inflation has stolen away the earning power of the social security contributions they made during their working years. Justice demands that Congress act now to increase these benefits to a reasonable, adequate level.

Mr. President, social-security benefits of 11 million retired Americans have been doubly squeezed into inadequacy. In their earning years, these retired people suffered economic depression, unemployment, and low wages. Now their retirement benefits reflect past low earnings and are further shrunk by rising prices. These people deserve increased social-security benefits now.

Mr. President, not a day goes by without my receiving more requests for help from constituents who cannot make ends meet on their social-security payments. I have here a letter from Mrs. Charles Smith, of 6523 West Fremont Place, in Milwaukee. Mrs. Smith is 66 and cannot find work because she is crippled, with an artificial limb. She and her husband, who is 75, live together on their social-security payment of \$65.50 a month. Mrs. Smith writes that the letter is her plea for more social security. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Smith's letter printed in the RECORD at this point, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: I read your folder you sent out and surely agree with you that the social security is not enough for old people to live on. Especially those who are old now and need it. When we were working years ago there was no such thing as social security, so as the result my husband and I together get \$65.50 per month, which is not enough to pay rent and fuel and living. I am crippled with an artificial limb and cannot work, also have a heart condition. My husband is 75 years old and tries to mow lawns to help us out. He also has a bad heart condition, too. We are too proud to ask for relief. So far we were living with my daughter, but they have a family of their own and have told us to move out. So what we could save with my husband's work we bought a secondhand, small trailer, but where can we park it. We can't afford to park in a trailer camp where they charge \$35, half of our social-security check. I guess the only place is a county home, where my husband and I would be separated. We don't want that as he is all I have and I am all he has to live for. So I say the social security that the old folks get is not enough. I will be 66 years old in

October. I also have diabetes with the heart condition.

You can print this if you like. It is my plea for more social security.

Mrs. CHARLES SMITH.

#### SOUTHERN DETERMINATION TO RETAIN LOCAL CONTROL OVER PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in his column in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, David Lawrence correctly interprets the determination of the people of the South to maintain their social order and to retain local control over their public school systems.

Mr. Lawrence also vividly points out the error of the Supreme Court of the United States in attempting to usurp the legislative functions of Congress.

This column serves to emphasize anew what responsible southern leaders have been trying to tell the Nation for 4 years now—that the social order of the South cannot be changed by judicial edict or the force of Federal bayonets—and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ARKANSAS AND THE CONSTITUTION—FAUBUS VOTE HELD RETURN TO THE LAW AS WRITTEN, NOT AS INTERPRETED

Maybe it's a demonstration of Arkansas nationalism we are witnessing—though perhaps "statism" is a more fitting word—but for some reason not clearly understood in the North the people of Arkansas, by the biggest landslide in their voting history, have just assured a third term for Governor Faubus.

Isn't this the man, it will be asked, who defied the supreme law of the land? Don't the people of Arkansas know what the law of the land is, or have they come to the conclusion that maybe the law of the land is what the Constitution says it is and not what nine justices say it is? For the Bill of Rights in the Constitution does say that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The people of Arkansas weighed all the arguments and decided to back the Constitution as it is written. They had listened for nearly a year to radio and television speeches of abuse and had read many articles in the press telling them they are lawless folks who don't obey the orders of the Federal courts. The Arkansas voters had protested in vain that critics in other States were oversimplifying the issue by saying that it was merely that man Faubus and a few zealots who were responsible for the crisis in the schools of Arkansas and that, if the present Governor were not in office, things would be different.

Now the people of Arkansas, in a free and fair election, have given their answer. They have voted by an overwhelming majority—about 70 percent of all ballots cast—to retain Governor Faubus. It's a break in tradition to give a third term to a governor in Arkansas. It was, therefore, an electorate deeply stirred which threw precedent aside in order to say to the rest of the States of the Union that Arkansas craves the privilege of deciding for itself how it shall educate its children.

For, up to 1954, education was considered to be solely a State problem, with no right to the Federal Government to assign pupils

to public schools, much less to send Federal troops to police the corridors of school buildings. But, while the Supreme Court 4 years ago vetoed segregation, it has not yet prescribed a formula for integration. Other States besides Arkansas are struggling with the same problem of how to retain control of their schools and yet keep them from being interfered with by the Supreme Court's edicts.

There wouldn't have been any such rumpus in Arkansas or in any other Southern State if the Congress, as specifically provided in the 14th amendment, had passed a law compelling desegregation. But for the Supreme Court suddenly to turn down its own 58-year-old order for separate but equal facilities in the schools by terming it now a violation of the 14th amendment—especially since the Court, itself, could not find the slightest bit of history to show that the framers of that amendment intended to take over control of educational systems of the States—is to arouse the people to demand that the law of the land, namely, the Constitution, itself, be followed. The 14th amendment stipulates that "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." This never has been done. The Supreme Court, moreover, isn't supposed to exercise any legislative power.

It is significant that the two candidates opposing Governor Faubus in the Democratic Party primary in Arkansas expressed themselves in favor of segregation in the schools, although they differed on how the formula is to be applied.

There is no doubt that the renomination of Governor Faubus in the Democratic primary—which is equivalent to election because there is no effective Republican Party in the State—will be regarded in other Southern States as encouragement and moral support.

Every Southern State would vote on the segregation issue exactly as has Arkansas. The same American "liberals" who are so quick to recognize as legitimate the aspirations of the Arabs or the Algerians or other nationalities to autonomous rights seem to forget that even in the United States there are aspirations to self-government by units known as the several States. When the Constitution was written, all the people were told that the States were never to be deprived of their sovereignty except under the means prescribed in the Constitution itself, for amending that document. States rights have since suffered as the Federal Government has gradually centralized more and more economic power in Washington. But where questions of sentiment and customs are concerned, the doctrine of States rights is as alive and as virile today as it was when Thomas Jefferson first taught it.

It is time for a more constructive approach to the problem of segregation and integration. It's an issue that can be resolved only by patience, reason, and tolerance of lengthy debate—and certainly not by bayonets.

#### SYSTEMS OF INSPECTION FOR SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the State Department released the text of a note from the American Embassy in Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating the willingness of the United States to go ahead with a technical conference on prevention of surprise attack.

As we know, Mr. President, the United States is now engaged at Geneva with the Soviet Union in a conference on the

technical aspects of inspection for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests. I have had some reports from that conference, and I am pleased to say they are all optimistic. The reports demonstrate considerable progress. According to the proposal today of the United States, the present conference would be followed by another similar conference in October on safeguards against surprise attack.

Mr. President, I heartily endorse the proposal made by the State Department. The device of joint technical conferences to work out systems of inspection is a new approach to the disarmament problem. It is one I myself proposed on several occasions. It has been proposed in many areas of our country and by many persons.

In an earlier speech on this floor in February, I said:

With respect to the requirements for both the inspection system for a cutoff or production and for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, I propose that the executive branch appoint two teams of prominent and highly qualified nuclear scientists and weapons experts. One should be charged with making a complete and thorough study of the requirements of inspection for a test ban; the other group for inspection for a cutoff of production. These two groups should offer to meet with comparable scientists and nuclear experts from the Soviet Union in order to devise inspection systems acceptable to both countries. If the U. S. S. R. refuses both of these proposals then we should try such a proposal on the nongovernmental level. The United States National Academy of Sciences could appoint two teams of weapons experts. These teams might then negotiate with the Soviet Academy of Sciences to determine whether they could agree on the necessary requirements of an inspection system to verify a test ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Although the current Geneva parley has not made its final report, the communiqués issued to date indicate that this approach has great potentiality for advancing the cause of international disarmament.

I predict that the Geneva Conference now under way will come forth with some sound and constructive proposals which will meet with the agreement and approval of the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America scientists. The State Department's decision to follow through with a proposal for a second conference on the subject of surprise attack is constructive and commendable. I underscore its importance, and commend the State Department and the Secretary for this very splendid initiative.

My only regret is that in the State Department's proposal there has to be a 2 months' delay before the Conference can convene. In a day when bombing aircraft can span oceans in a matter of hours and long-range missiles can flash thousands of miles in a matter of minutes agreement by this country and Moscow on a method of preventing surprise attack could add substantially to international confidence and security. The progress of military technology is so rapid that it threatens to get out of hand before any sort of disarmament controls can ever be agreed upon or put into effect.

The world has already delayed too long in coming to terms on methods of mitigating or ending the arms race. If the administration were well prepared on the subject of surprise attack, there should be no reason why we should have to wait 2 whole months before the Conference convenes. The Subcommittee on Disarmament months ago urged the administration to study the technical problems of inspection. In its report issued last fall, the subcommittee declared that it had received few details from the executive branch on inspection provisions. The subcommittee asserted, "It has been unable to learn, for example, how a ground inspection system would operate to guard against surprise attack." The subcommittee then went on to say, "The subcommittee strongly recommends that if inspection plans have not yet been prepared, an effort be made promptly by the executive branch to draw up blueprints for various types of inspection systems now under consideration." I think, Mr. President, that if these blueprints had been drawn up, that we could now proceed forthwith and without delay with this Conference on surprise attack and not have to wait 2 months while the world staggers from one crisis to another, in many of which the danger of surprise attack adds to the heat of international tension.

In any case, Mr. President, I think that the proposal for a technical conference on surprise attack can carry us another step forward toward a more peaceful day and I urge that the administration pursue it vigorously to a successful outcome. At this point, Mr. President, I would like to insert the text of the American note to the Soviet Foreign Affairs Ministry.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SURPRISE ATTACK

Following is the text of a note delivered today by the American Embassy at Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the prevention of surprise attack:

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to the letters of May 9, 1958, and July 2, 1958, from Prime Minister Khrushchev to President Eisenhower with regard to the problem of preventing surprise attack. The Prime Minister's letters commented upon the proposals of the United States on this subject and advanced certain additional proposals of the Soviet Government. The Government of the United States would like now to reply to these letters insofar as they relate to this important question.

As President Eisenhower pointed out in his letter of April 28, 1958, the United States is determined that the Soviet Union and United States ultimately reach an agreement on disarmament. As an effective means of moving toward ultimate agreement, he proposed that technical experts start to work immediately upon the practical problems involved. In this connection, he raised the question whether both sides would not be in a better position to reach agreements if there were a common accepted understanding as to methods of inspecting against surprise attack. It is noted that Prime Min-

ister Khrushchev now suggests that appropriate representatives—including those of the military agencies of both sides, e. g., at the level of experts—designated by the Soviet Union, the United States and possibly by the governments of certain other states meet for a joint study of the practical aspects of this problem. Accordingly, the United States proposes that qualified persons from each side meet for a study of the technical aspects of safeguards against the possibility of surprise attack. They should concentrate on the means and objects of control, and on the results which could be secured from these safeguards.

The discussions could bear, if necessary, on the applicability of inspection measures to various areas for illustrative purposes only, but without prejudging in any way the boundaries within which such measures should be applied. It will be recalled that the United States has always favored the broadest possible application of such measures, and that in fact in President Eisenhower's initial proposal in 1955 he suggested that the entire territories of the United States and the Soviet Union be open to inspection. The United States assumes, on the basis of Prime Minister Khrushchev's letter of July 2, 1958, that the Soviet Government agrees that these discussions would take place without prejudice to the respective positions of the two Governments as to the delimitation of areas within which safeguards would be established, or as to the timing or interdependence of various aspects of disarmament. The United States does not agree that the particular areas to be supervised as against surprise attack should be those indicated by Prime Minister Khrushchev's letter of July 2, 1958.

In this connection, the Government of the United States must indicate disagreement with Prime Minister Khrushchev's statement that the proposals relating to zones of inspection against surprise attack put forward by the United States, United Kingdom, and France on May 28, 1958, fail to strike a balance between the interests of both sides. It is the zones of inspection proposed by the Soviet Government which are subject to this criticism. This is particularly true of the European zone proposal which covers only a very limited area, scarcely touching Russian territory and far too small to cover the areas from which a surprise attack would be launched under modern conditions. Moreover, this proposal seems to be motivated by the political desire to crystallize the present dividing line in Europe since it is calculated from the "line of demarcation" between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The United States believes, however, that joint technical studies would make it easier to reach agreement later at a political level on the definition of the regions in which the safeguards would apply. Accordingly, the United States proposes that during the first week of October, which is the earliest date by which preparations adequate to the significance and complexity of the task can be completed, these discussions begin in Geneva. In view of the Charter responsibilities of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the United States would propose to keep the United Nations informed of the progress of the talks through the Secretary General. Further arrangements for the meeting can be concluded through diplomatic channels.

In his letter of May 9, 1958, in particular, and again on July 2, 1958, Prime Minister Khrushchev also referred to the question of United States military flights especially in the Arctic area.

The United States regrets that unfounded charges continue regarding United States flights in the Arctic area and that the Soviet Union continues to reject United States pro-



posals for a timely international inspection system in this area which would serve the end which the Soviet Union proposes, namely, "to prevent this area from becoming a hot-bed of military conflict between our countries."

It is stated that the proposal of the United States for inspection in this area, a proposal which commanded general support not only in the United Nations Security Council but throughout the world, is no solution because the United States did not promise to suspend atomic bomber flights in the direction of the Soviet Union if an Arctic zone were established.

With respect to that statement, the United States desires to correct the apparent misunderstanding concerning atomic bomber operations of the United States. The greater portion of the Arctic zone airspace is internationally free. There is considerable military aviation activity in that area, participated in by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations of the world. The statements of the Soviet representatives in the United Nations Security Council, however, indicate concern that in this or other areas military aircraft of the United States armed with hydrogen and atomic bombs may have been sent in the direction of the borders of the Soviet Union as a result of a misinterpreted radar blip or other false alert. The Government of the United States gives categorical assurances that the United States has never had the need to launch nor has it in fact ever launched any atomic bomber flights of this type. Furthermore, if dependable and adequate safeguards were to be provided against surprise attack, then, of course, any United States flights entering, leaving, or operating within an Arctic zone would conform to agreed control measures.

The United States believes that technical discussions of measures to reduce the possibility of surprise attack, even though made without reference to particular areas, will produce a fuller realization of the value of an Arctic zone, and pave the way for agreement on safeguards in this and other regions. Such technical discussion would also be helpful in determining whether a meeting of heads of Government would provide opportunity for conducting serious discussions of major problems and would be an effective means of reaching agreement on significant subjects.

**MR. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "A-Weapons Detection System Can Be Workable, Study Says," written by Edward Gamarekian, of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This particular article refers to a study which has just been concluded at Columbia University. I commented upon this study the other day, but I find that this news item analyzes the study in a most concise and objective manner. It is indeed worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. Mark my words, there is no subject more important before us now than a system of detection which is safeguarded and workable. There seems to be a tendency to work out such a system, which ultimately may come to the Congress for our ratification.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**A-WEAPONS DETECTION SYSTEM CAN BE WORKABLE, STUDY SAYS**

(By Edward Gamarekian)

A major obstacle in the way of disarmament has been the lack of a foolproof inspection system.

Fifty scientists, engineers, and specialists from the United States and abroad have just completed an exhaustive study which concludes:

That an absolutely foolproof system is impossible.

That the testing of nuclear weapons and missiles can be detected with almost absolute certainty by detection stations within a range of 300 miles.

That the production of such devices can be detected with a reasonable degree of certainty, although clandestine operations may go unnoticed.

That stockpiles already in existence can be readily hidden.

That the cutting off of missile production by a workable system of inspection might lead to other schemes of weapon delivery more difficult to detect, such as the transporting of nuclear bombs in suitcases or in items of trade.

Also that the cutting off of nuclear-weapon production may lead to alternate weapons, such as poisons, diseases, or radioactive devices which can be used against large numbers of people.

#### INSTITUTE BACKED STUDY

The study was organized by Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering at Columbia University. It was carried out as part of the program of Columbia's Institute of War and Peace Studies under a grant from the Institute for International Order, of New York.

In a summary statement accompanying the individual reports of the 50 participants, Melman concluded that "the strong points of inspection systems are more than sufficient to form the basis for an optimistic estimate of workability."

"The gains that could be obtained for the security of mankind by the relaxation of the arms race are so substantial," he added, "as to be well worth the risks of successful evasion that may be involved in concluding disarmament agreements."

The success of an inspection system, he emphasized, depended on complete freedom of movement by teams of competent scientists plus a willingness on the part of the native populace to cooperate and report suspected violations.

No secret or classified information was utilized in the preparation of any of the reports, according to Melman.

The Institute of War and Peace Studies was created in 1951, largely on the initiative of Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was then president of Columbia University. At the time, Mr. Eisenhower was on leave to head the allied armies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

An unusual technique was used during the overall study to give it added dimension. Three teams were set up to find ways of evading and outwitting all the known schemes of detection and inspection. Two were American and one was British.

Their objective was to be the preparation and maintenance of 200 to 400 intercontinental missiles, of existing design, in the conviction that the country was unsafe without them.

The conditions that were assumed to exist were (1) an international agreement destroying and prohibiting further production of all weapons of war, including conventional and biological weapons as well as nuclear explosives and their delivery systems, (2) an inspection group of the highest caliber with an ample budget and unrestricted access to places and people, (3) an international agreement making it obligatory for the citizens of all countries to report evidence of violations, and (4) a judicial and penal system for punishing violators as felons.

The evasion teams could also assume, however, that they had government support in the form of funds and authority. Their

plans would be carried out by a directorate consisting of senior military men, industrial executives, and one cabinet member.

#### CHANCES CONSIDERED

One evasion team, made up of Americans, concluded that the "chances for a successful clandestine arming operation are quite favorable, even in the presence of a very large inspectorate."

They described schemes for secretly producing missiles, stealing material for warheads, and using chemical and biological weapons.

The other team of Americans felt that effective inspection could be defeated by the failure of a nation to destroy its stockpile of weapons and also by the manufacture of peaceful goods whose components could be used to produce weapons.

The British team concluded that evasion in countries other than the United States and U. S. S. R. would be possible only on a small scale.

#### ACTIVITIES OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AT UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

**MR. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Victories in Security Council Almost Meaningless," written by Graham Hovey, a reporter at the United Nations for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, and a well-known foreign correspondent. I ask to have this article printed in the body of the RECORD, inasmuch as it relates to the activities of our Government at the United Nations Security Council, and the methods and means we are now using to obtain support for American proposals. This article has caused most grave concern. Mr. Hovey is an objective reporter and a keen student of international affairs. If what he says as to the methods we are using and the difficulties we are encountering is true, we are really in trouble.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES VICTORIES IN SECURITY COUNCIL

##### ALMOST MEANINGLESS

(By Graham Hovey)

United States victories in United Nations Security Council voting have become practically meaningless.

American insistence on driving for almost automatic majorities is eroding further the prestige of a Security Council already badly damaged by Russia's flagrant abuse of the big-power veto.

These things were brought home again last week by Council votes on resolutions aimed at easing the Middle East crisis. After watching 9 of 11 members vote for the United States resolution to send a U. N. armed force to Lebanon, only to have it vetoed by Soviet Ambassador Arkady Sobolev, a veteran Asian correspondent whose friendship for America cannot be doubted told this reporter:

"Your delegation's zeal for rolling up council majorities—no less than the Soviet vetoes—has brought the Security Council into utter disrepute."

His point was that the familiar 9-to-1 majorities for United States-sponsored resolutions (neutral Sweden abstaining) rarely reflect the state of world opinion or even the lineup of the 81 U. N. member governments.

Mostly they reflect the views of the United States Government and its allies.

One simple fact will demonstrate how far the present Security Council member-

ship comes from reflecting the true world power balance; how stacked it is for the United States and its allies:

Seven of the other ten Council members have outright military alliances with the United States and an eighth, Iraq, had at least unofficial security ties to this country through the Baghdad Pact.

Britain, France, and Canada are allied with the United States in NATO; Columbia and Panama are our allies in the inter-American defense treaty; Japan and Nationalist China each has a bilateral military alliance with our Government.

Only Soviet Russia and Sweden on the present council stand entirely apart from the globe-encircling network of United States military alliances. And the Asian-African group of cold-war neutrals is not represented.

For some years an unofficial gentlemen's agreement between Russia and the West resulted in the regular election of one Eastern European Communist government to the Council.

The United States ignored this agreement 2 years ago to back the Philippines and repeated the process last year to support Japan's successful bid for a term on the Council. This scrapping of what had been regarded as an accepted formula aroused resentment not only in the Soviet bloc but outside as well.

But the United States is not entirely to blame for the present Council lineup. Some new nations of Asia and Africa—especially those with an internal Communist problem—are not overly eager to bask in the Security Council spotlight and accept the pressures from East and West that membership involves.

"By any standard of measure, however," said my Asian colleague, "it makes no sense to have two Council members from Latin America. And, of course, it is fantastic to have a man who actually represents only Formosa holding the permanent Council seat that the charter assigned to China."

"If the Council continues to refuse to seat the representative of Iraq's new revolutionary regime, the picture will become even more fantastic. There will be two fictional representatives at the Council table."

He referred to the fact that the Council last week took no action to expel Abdul Majid Abbass, U. N. delegate of the overthrown Iraqi Government.

It has long been obvious to veteran U. N. observers that something should be done about the security council in an attempt to arrest the erosion of the organization's political machinery.

This job may require some imagination and some pride swallowing by the United States. For most authorities who have expressed themselves on the matter favor an expanded Security Council to include India and eventually Communist China as permanent members.

In terms of its power potential and present political influence, particularly with the expanding Asian-African group of nations, India is entitled to a permanent Council seat. If eventual admission of Red China to the U. N. is conceded, the United States conceivably might insist on a permanent seat for India as a balancing Asian factor.

Such an expanded Council would not be perfect. It would not by itself necessarily save the U. N. It would not even guarantee less frequent use of the veto by Russia.

Its proponents believe, however, that it could make for a healthier U. N. because it would come ever so much closer to an accurate reflection of the existing power and political balance in the world.

They believe it might even have a leavening effect on Russia by removing the Soviet delegate from the complete isolation in which he must function on the Council—

an isolation that sometimes elicits sympathy for him and even defense of his defiant vetoes in strongly anti-Communist circles.

#### FARMERS PROTEST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was a sad day for agriculture when this body bowed to Secretary Benson by enacting a farm bill hailed by the city press as heading our farm policies in a new direction. As I insisted throughout the farm debate, I am convinced it is the wrong direction.

During the farm debate, I expressed regret that the American Farm Bureau Federation had so far abandoned the principles upon which it grew to power under the late Ed O'Neal. I indicated that I felt the views of its national spokesmen failed to accurately reflect the feelings of many of its farmer members.

I call attention to a letter I have just received from the legislative committee of the Cochran County Farm Bureau in Texas, echoing that sentiment. The letter was written last Friday, before the Senate had concluded action, but it was not received by me until yesterday.

Signed by three members of the Texas Farm Bureau's legislative committee, it speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD as evidence of how farmers really feel.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTON TEX., July 25, 1958.

MR. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We would like to submit to you some of the ideas developed and recommended by the members of our organization with reference to agricultural legislation, as follows:

First, we want you to know that the National Farm Bureau does not speak our sentiments nor our wishes. It does not represent the farmers wishes in Washington, but the thinking of the national office. We think that if the Farm Bureau was stripped of its service organizations, wherein its members make huge savings in all types of insurance (this amount would be of interest to you, it runs into millions of dollars), the number of its members they come and tell you they represent would drop rapidly. The number of its members who do not have an interest in a farm would also be revealing and of interest. It is not a requirement that its members be farmers, and thousands are not.

Second, we hope that legislation on cotton can wait until after the national referendum on the program is held this fall, where only cottongrowers are allowed to vote. This will give the best idea as to what the farmers want.

Third, we believe that the farmers will never prosper as a producer of raw materials, leaving the marketing and processing to other groups. Has, or can, any other industry prospered by following this process? The CCC and support prices are the salvation to farmers welfare. Without them all agriculture will become integrated in a short time.

Fourth, if we have a surplus of cotton, as Secretary Benson says, and which we do not have (we now have the shortest supply of cotton since 1954, following 3 years of uncontrolled production), why raise the allotment and cut the prices, as Benson sug-

gests, along with the National Farm Bureau?

Fifth, we do not think agriculture can survive a free market, where they sell all their produce on a "what cha gimme market" and buy on a price tag.

Sixth, if the Secretary of Agriculture would spend some time and energy explaining to consumer groups that it is not the price of farm products that is responsible for increased food costs, but the handlers and processors, after it leaves the farms; for instance, the dairyman gets about 8 cents a quart for his milk at the farm, the egg man about 35 cents per dozen, potatoes are now 2 cents per pound, tomatoes 2½ cents, onions 2½ cents, and thousands of tons of produce are rotting in the fields for the lack of cost of production prices; and, what are you paying for these products as a consumer? We think that cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and all other supported products would follow the same pattern. We know that they will say, "Oh, yes; look at the cattlemen, the hog men, and the sheepmen"—well if they do, ask them to look back at them a few years ago when hundreds of them went broke.

Seventh, you have been hounded in Washington with this group and that group telling you that they represent the farmers; but, have you become aware that few of them do. Too many groups are spending a lot of time in Washington to tell you what they want, under the guise of farmer representatives. The processors and handlers of farm products are not interested in the welfare of the farmer—they are interested in volume and units of production. Controls are socialistic and communistic when applied to agriculture, but become very effective weapons with all major industries, where the board of directors set the policies; and, then the same process is termed sound business without a "tic" on it.

We just wanted you to know some of the thinking which has been developed down here in Texas, where no one was present but actual farmers, and hope that you and the other gentlemen in Washington will not let the Secretary of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau representatives destroy the foundation of our price support and CCC programs for agriculture, and that you realize the importance of a prosperous agriculture.

Respectively,

ROY HICKMAN,  
GENE BENHAM,  
MERLYN ROBERTS,

Legislative Committee for Cochran  
County Farm Bureau.

P. S.—Why eliminate the present parity concept for those beginning in 1961, based on 90 percent of the prices received by farmers during the 3 preceding years, which will mean lower and lower prices?

Proposed legislation will create a surplus cotton problem similar to corn. The big increased allotments with lower prices will bring this about, and it will be the fault of the Democrats who are in control, and the problem for the 1960 administration to correct. Why should the present legislation go beyond 1960?

Why not include an escalator clause to take care of increased farming costs?

Please don't let Benson and company destroy the basis of our agricultural program, they are trying. R. H.

#### MINING RESEARCH STATION IN MINNESOTA—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that the Interior Department has undertaken the establishment of a



mining research station in Minnesota, thereby achieving the objective sought by Calendar No. 482, S. 98, to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota, as well as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, approves of removing the bill from the Senate Calendar, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I approve of the request of the distinguished majority leader. I want the RECORD to note that the metallurgical research establishment is being constructed, not because of the consent or with help of the Bureau of the Budget or the administration. It is being built because Congress insisted upon it. Authority for its construction has been provided in existing law. It was once approved by the Bureau of the Budget, in 1952, but such approval has not been given since then. I am grateful to Congress for the cooperation which it has extended to the State of Minnesota in making this metallurgical establishment a reality.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTES TO DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that, following the convening of the Senate on Monday, tributes will be paid to the late Senator Scott, of North Carolina, and the late Senator Neely, of West Virginia.

#### THE AIRWAYS MODERNIZATION BOARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the American Aviation magazine of July 28, 1958, in which the magazine acknowledges and gives due recognition to the effective efforts of some of our most competent public servants.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

##### ORCHIDS

The things that men do wrong, or the things that men don't do that they should be doing, most often get top attention in conversation and in print, especially editorials.

A report is overdue on three important Government jobs which we believe are being well done.

First, is Presidential Assistant Elwood "Pete" Quesada, who is confounding all of the skeptics and critics by turning in a terrific performance by all of the usual standards of measurement. He is carrying a dual

load—Airways Modernization Board and Presidential Aid—with bustling dispatch and sound judgment.

Second is CAA Administrator Jim Pyle, who inherited a mass of problems and a laggard organization. With workloads and headaches worse than ever, he has proved to be a nimble, able administrator not afraid to make decisions and not afraid to stick out his neck. Only in the international field, where he inherited an exceptionally bad situation, has he failed to produce solid results to date.

Third is George Borsari, who took over a few months ago the hefty task of heading up the CAA Airports Division—a bigger and more important job than the title would imply. What was needed here was an ability to organize, to make decisions and to get things moving. Borsari is doing all of this.

It is an all-too-common practice in Government to postpone decisions, buck a problem to another office, find some excuse for not making a decision that might make somebody unhappy, and to hope that if a problem hangs around long enough it will just disappear. Decision-making is one of the most vital keys to good administration. Whether or not everybody likes what Messrs. Quesada, Pyle, or Borsari are doing, these men deserve the highest tribute for moving ahead and making decisions.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 2 days ago on the floor of the Senate, during the course of the consideration of the Defense Department appropriations bill, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made what seemed to me to be a brilliant, if not indeed frightening, speech on the inadequacy of our Armed Forces. During the course of that debate he had occasion to deplore what seemed to be the disappearance of any sense of urgency in the country toward our defense posture. This sense of urgency had been aroused by sputnik, but it has been dissipated, despite the efforts of our distinguished majority leader and his Preparedness Subcommittee and a number of other Senators to keep it alive.

Last night, in the Evening Star, there appeared an article by Mr. Constantine Brown entitled "The Menace of Disinterest—Events Across World Seen Affecting All in United States, Including 'So What' Tribe."

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### THE MENACE OF DISINTEREST (By Constantine Brown)

There are a lot of Smiths and Joneses in the United States. But there is a name more legion than either of these old reliables, although it never appears in telephone directories. The name is "Sowhat."

A typical Sowhat, or So What, if you will, may be found in every city and town, every country crossroads store, every club and bar in America. Oftentimes Mr. So What will be a leader in his community, a civic worker, a churchgoer. He may be, and often is, a member of a legislature or a city council. He is prosperous in business or in one of the professions. He is level-headed, sound, careful, thoughtful, responsible, and conservative.

But when something comes along outside the ken of his daily activities, something

having to do with events and developments far from his own habitat, he spreads his hands, shrugs his shoulders and says, "So what?"

So, what if the Russians are fomenting strife and discord in the Middle East (or Asia, or Africa, or South America)? That's a long way from here. Besides, what can we do about it? What do we care if a bunch of bedsheet-wearing desert nomads get worked up about whatever sheikh or sultan or king they happen to have, and shoot a few people while they look for a new government?

Why, asks Mr. So What crossly, are we talking about intervention, sending American troops into foreign climes, spending billions of dollars on foolishness, just to try meddling in some foreign matter that has nothing to do with the daily routine in which Mr. So What has his complacent being?

Above all, complains Mr. So What, why are our Senators down there in Washington and our President and the Secretary of State and all those officials great and small spending all their time fooling around with all this foreign talk when they need to get down to business and get business up for us Americans?

And why are all those politician fellows getting all worked up about a few American-type Communists and their pals who might like to betray their country's survival to a foreign ideology and a menacing military aggressor?

The trouble with Mr. So-what, all thousands of him, is that he stops at the questions. He asks why because he is annoyed at the disturbance to his comfortable ways. But his why does not bestir him to find out why.

And the tragedy is that Mr. So-what, as we said when we introduced him, is not a dolt, a ne'er-do well, or even a run-of-the-mill citizen. He is a leader, or is looked up to as such, at least, in his community. Yet he sets the example to his fellow citizens of lesser stature, and the example is the hands-spread-out "so what" when matters lie outside his immediate interest.

It may be submitted that this So-what fellow is probably more of a danger to the Free World, to freedom in America and everywhere else in the still-remaining and rapidly dwindling area of the world that is free, than 10 times his number of diligent Communist agents, or a hundred times his number of just plain Communist subjects.

If one is to argue with a So-what, the annoyed reply one gets is petulant, "What can I do about it, anyway?" The answer to that one is just "plenty." Not at all by getting all excited and frenzied, worked up into a lather, or emotionally intoxicated. But just getting familiar with the world situation, at the same time realizing, like the great English poet, John Donne, that "every man's death diminishes me, for I am a part of mankind." Putting the two together—a knowledge of events and their significance, plus the realization that in this shrinking world no man can resign from the common destiny of mankind—will bring an end to the So-whats quite definitely.

These days the events taking place in the Middle East, in Asia or Africa or Greenland or Antarctica, are of immediate concern to the men and women of the United States. They can and probably will affect the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in America, not to mention the millions of people everywhere else.

Perhaps we who deplore the So-whats can begin by making every one we meet provide the answers to his own querulous question.

Mr. CLARK. I believe it would be wise for all readers of the RECORD to take note of Mr. Brown's comment that—

These days, the events taking place in the Middle East, in Asia or Africa or Greenland

or Antarctica are of immediate concern to the men and women of the United States. They can and probably will affect the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in America, not to mention the millions of people everywhere else.

This matter was even more clearly brought to the attention of the American people in a column appearing this morning in the Washington Post entitled "Untruths on Defense," written by Joseph Alsop. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNTRUTHS ON DEFENSE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The time has come, once again, to take a very grave step in this space. It is time to say quite bluntly that the Eisenhower administration is guilty of gross untruth concerning the national defense of the United States.

The false claims were most succinctly put by the President himself in his last state of the Nation message.

"We have now," he told the country, "a broadly based and efficient defensive strength, including a great deterrent power. But unless we act wisely and promptly, we could lose (the) capacity to deter attack or defend ourselves." He then outlined the action he proposed to take and he concluded with this promise: "We intend to assure that our vigilance, power, and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat that we face."

Either the President was consciously misleading the Nation, or he silently decided to break his promise later on, or he has been misinformed about the facts. The third alternative is not only preferable; it is also highly probable. But that does not change the hard facts about which the President has been misinformed. Nothing will change them but a vastly greater national effort to keep abreast of the realistic threat we face.

The time of deadly danger will begin soon, during the period the Pentagon calls "the gap"—the years between 1960 through 1963 or 1964. Massive orders for hardware must be placed immediately—indeed, they should have been placed last winter—if we are going to make the feeblest pretense of keeping abreast during the years of the gap.

The prospective results of our present, fantastically inadequate effort were given in detail in the last report in this space. They may be summarized as follows:

First, we shall retain a modest margin of superiority in manned bombers throughout the years of the gap—unless the Kremlin puts its new, very long-range, supersonic jet bomber into early production, as must of course be expected. (It is not expected by the administration, but all the administration's expectations are based on the kind of reading of the grim intelligence that experience has repeatedly warned against.)

Second, the NATO estimates give the Soviets a strength in air defense that is at least 2 times, if not 3 or 4 times greater than our own air-defense strength; and this wide margin of superiority will be maintained throughout the years of the gap. This means, of course, that the balance of manned bomber strength must be weighed in favor of the Soviets; for our manned bombers are now increasingly vulnerable to interception by the more advanced defensive weapons.

Third, we shall be sending a few intermediate range missiles to our NATO allies in the gap years. Meanwhile, the Soviets will acquire between 1,000 and 2,000 ballistic missiles with suitable ranges to neutralize

or destroy all our overseas air bases, on which the striking power of our manned bomber force heavily depends. And fourth, the United States versus U. S. S. R. score in operational intercontinental missiles in the gap years will be United States, no intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 100 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1959; United States, 30 intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 500 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1960; United States, 70 intercontinental ballistic missiles versus U. S. S. R., 1,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1961; United States, 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles (plus a few submarine-borne Polaris, perhaps) versus U. S. S. R., 1,500 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1962; and United States, 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles (plus more Polaris) versus U. S. S. R., 2,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1963.

Furthermore, only a few score more of the Navy's Polaris missiles will alter the balance in 1964. And the first solid-fueled Minuteman missile, on which the Pentagon is gambling the American future, cannot possibly be ready for operational use before the end of 1963 or early 1964. It will probably be later than this.

If this is keeping abreast, one would like to know how the administration defines falling behind. The effect of the present policy is indisputable. It will allow the Soviets to gain an overwhelming superiority in overall nuclear striking power. And if anyone wonders what results to expect from this kind of Soviet superiority, it is only necessary to look back a few years, to the last time this reporter took the same grave step of charging official untruth about the national defense.

This was when the egregious Louis A. Johnson was swearing he was only cutting fat, not muscle. The Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament policy ended in the Korean war. But at least President Truman and Louis Johnson then had the excuse that the United States still possessed a virtual monopoly of nuclear striking power.

Now we are flaccidly letting the Soviets gain an overwhelming superiority in this crucial area where once we enjoyed a monopoly. We are doing this, moreover, after abandoning superiority to the Soviets in almost all other arms areas. Can any sane man suppose that this folly is not immeasurably more dangerous than the follies of Louis Johnson or can any sane man seriously suppose that the end result will not be immeasurably more terrible? At this instant, the last chance to save ourselves is slipping through our hands.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, this article is a follow-up of the one placed in the RECORD during the course of the speech by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] 2 days ago. I say now, as I said then, that these articles, written by Mr. Alsop, require—indeed, demand—an answer by the Pentagon and the Department of Defense, if not by the White House.

I firmly believe that the American people are entitled to know whether what Mr. Alsop says is true. If it is true, we should be moving forward with far more serious steps than we are taking at present.

MR. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret that I was unable to be in the Chamber

yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], reluctantly asked the Senate to agree to the conference report on the budget for the District of Columbia. As the Senator from Rhode Island so well said at that time, that budget is unsound, it is unbalanced, and under it an adequate Federal payment from the Federal Treasury to the District of Columbia is not made. Inevitably, it will cause great difficulty when Congress reconvenes in January.

This point of view has been so well expressed and so much better stated than I could state it by an editorial entitled "Who's Head in the Sand?" published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, that I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHOSE HEAD IN THE SAND?

Congress shamefully flubbed its obligation as the policy-making body of the District in passing the 1959 appropriations bill. In the first place, it reduced appropriations to the skimpy level of \$204 million by eliminating many items of importance to the community. The Senate had added \$2.9 million to the barebones budget approved by the House, but in the conference all but \$757,360 of this was wiped out, with the acquiescence of both Houses. The Senate usually has good intentions in regard to the District, but in the end it gives way to the more stubborn House conferees who seem to make a religion of imposing austerity on the voteless Capital.

Even more disturbing was the niggardly squeeze applied to the Federal payment to the District. Congress had recently raised the legal ceiling on this payment from \$23 to \$32 million in recognition of the numerous services the Federal Government receives from the District and of the Federal interest in Washington as the Nation's Capital. Congress, instead of living up to its implied promise, appropriated a meager \$20 million. Its action reminds us of the star boarder who presided at the head of the table, took the best of everything and left a quarter to pay for it.

The foolishness of the performance is emphasized by the fact that Congress will have to face the problem again in January. It is estimated that increased pay and retirement benefits for District employees will amount to between \$18.6 and \$24.2 million. This will mean a deficit of \$10 to \$15 million before the end of the fiscal year. The only place that Congress can reasonably turn for funds to meet this deficit will be to the Federal payment which has been authorized but not appropriated. In view of this situation the performance of yesterday was incredibly shortsighted.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MISS MARIAN ANDERSON AS AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I was unable to be in the Chamber 2 days ago when the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the other Senators commented with great pleasure on the appointment of Miss Marian Anderson as an alternate representative of the United



States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Miss Anderson is a resident of Philadelphia. She is one of our leading citizens, one of whom we are extremely proud. Her public career has been a credit to her home city.

She is, I think, the only living citizen of Philadelphia for whom one of our fine new swimming pools, built under a recreational program with which, I am pleased to say, I had something to do while I was mayor, has been named. Miss Anderson dedicated that swimming pool. We were more than happy to have her do so.

Miss Anderson has been one of our great Philadelphians. I join with my colleagues in expressing my gratification that the President has seen fit to honor her with this appointment. I am certain she will be a most effective representative of the United States of America.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### PREPARATIONS FOR THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have been gravely concerned about the attitude of the State Department in getting ready for the forthcoming, inevitable summit conference. I have read this morning a transcript of the news conference of the Secretary of State. I have also read the latest in the series of letters from the President to Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. President, I am gravely disturbed by the public statements of Mr. Dulles in his press conference that the Department of State is not prepared either to go ahead with disarmament negotiations or, indeed, to attend a serious summit conference on the Middle East. Why is not the State Department so prepared? We all know that there are many able persons in the Department who are well qualified to prepare the necessary papers and agenda for such a conference.

If they are not prepared, why has the Secretary of State publicly announced that he is about to take off for South America for a conference, no doubt of some importance, with nations in Latin America? At a time when it would seem to me that the Department is not prepared, should he not stay home and prepare the impending conference on the situation which threatens us in the Middle East.

In this connection, I regret very much that the Department of State seems to be taking a position, with the acquiescence of the President, that the United States is not in favor of private meetings to try to solve the problems which divide Russia and ourselves, at the time the Security Council meeting takes place in New York or elsewhere.

I point out to my colleagues and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that, from my point of view, Mr. De Gaulle, of France, has taken a far more realistic position in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his reply to the latest letter from Mr. Khrushchev be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message of General De Gaulle was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 1, 1958]

#### TEXT OF REPLY BY DE GAULLE

PARIS, July 31.—Following, in unofficial translation, is the text of Gen. Charles de Gaulle's message to Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, published here tonight:

"Your letter of July 29 insists on the importance and the urgency in your eyes for the meeting of a conference of the heads of the Governments of the Soviet Union, of the United States of America, of Great Britain, of France, and of India, to study the problems of the Middle East.

"You envisage that such a conference be held in Europe. You indicate that it should have as its object 'to insure the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan and to prevent the extension of the military conflict.'

"As regards the principle of a meeting of heads of government, I confirm to you the acceptance of the French Government as soon as such a meeting would take place in the necessary conditions of objectivity and serenity.

"If the other governments concerned were agreed that such a conference be held and if they could do it in these conditions, I would be ready to go to any city of Europe and at any date that would be convenient to the participants.

"I would propose for my part that it would be Geneva on August 18 next.

"As regards the object of the conference, I believe that it should not be limited to the problem raised by the presence of United States troops in the Lebanon and British troops in Jordan, which is but by the consequence of a general situation, nor to the possible extension of the zone of military conflict, because one sees no conflict of this sort.

"It is, in my opinion, the whole Middle East affair and the state of continual crisis that prevents this region of the world from living and developing in normal conditions that the conference would have to tackle in a frank and complete manner.

"After the consultation France is at present conducting with certain other states, she may, if the occasion arises, make precise proposals on these subjects.

"Pending a decision by the governments concerned as regards the project for a summit conference, the French Government makes no objection to the Security Council's holding a new session, as suggested by the British and United States Governments.

"However, such a session, because of the composition of the Council, the number of states that should be invited to participate, the nature of its agenda, and the character of its debates, should not be confused with a conference of heads of government.

"In any case I have the feeling that it would be desirable henceforth to pursue through normal diplomatic channels the discussions that might still be necessary to reach agreement as regards the principle, the place, the date, and the object of the conference which you, yourself, first proposed."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of our keenest and most eloquent commentators in the international field is Mr. James Reston. His column this morning is devoted to the subject about which I am now speaking. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article entitled "Smoke-Filled Rooms," published in the New York Times for today, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SMOKE-FILLED ROOMS—UNITED STATES FOUND ALONE IN DISLIKING IDEA OF FORMAL-INFORMAL PRIVATE TALKS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—The long debate on the art and wisdom of summitry reached a critical point today—namely, whether there should be a smoke-filled room at the summit when and if the great men get there.

On this question, the United States, which invented the smoke-filled room at the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago during the 1920 Republican convention, said "No." In the sense that Harry Daugherty, Warren G. Harding's campaign manager, meant the phrase—a room where a few political leaders would meet and decide the major political questions—Washington is opposed.

However, Premier Charles de Gaulle, of France, wants precisely this kind of room at the summit, free of the binding regulations of the United Nations. Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, of Britain, appears more interested in arranging private talks, though under the supervision of the United Nations, than he is in the Security Council appearances of the heads of government. And so does Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

If this seems a narrow point to preoccupy great nations, the reader should know that solemn diplomatic notes have been passing back and forth across the Atlantic for days on even narrower points than this.

For example, there has been considerable discussion in the embassies here yesterday and today about what constitutes a smoke-filled-room session.

Does the United States rule out informal talks altogether, or only informal talks that attempt to reach decisions? Would it be all right to meet and just talk in a smoke-filled room? And, finally, would Washington agree to formal-informal talks or insist on informal-informal talks?

#### THE UNITED STATES POSITION

After 14 personal interviews and 43 telephone calls, this reporter is in a position to define the United States position as follows:

Secretary of State Dulles does not rule out accidental talks between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev if they happen to meet in a United Nations or hotel corridor.

Social gatherings are O. K. if, after dinner in, say, Prime Minister Macmillan's hotel room, Mr. Khrushchev makes some serious observations about the Middle East, the President would listen and might participate in the discussion. This would be an informal-informal talk.

If, however, someone suggested that President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev, General de Gaulle, and Mr. Macmillan should meet every day 2 hours before the formal meeting of the Security Council to discuss ways and means of resolving questions that had risen there, this would be opposed by the United States on the ground that it was a formal-informal meeting and would amount to ganging up on the small nations.

Finally, provided the talks are kept to charges and countercharges concerning military and political action in the Middle East, Moscow's as well as Washington's and London's the United States will debate the issue in public anywhere the Council likes—in New York, Geneva, Paris, or anywhere else—except the Soviet Union.

#### MOST PECULIAR TO SOME

This, of course, strikes the British, the French, and the Russians as a most peculiar conception of summitry.

The Russians, who really did invent the smoke-filled room before Harry Daugherty made it famous, would like to carve up and parcel out the Middle East in the smallest

room in Geneva. This, essentially, is what Washington says it opposes: Big-power domination of the rest.

General de Gaulle, who has been clearer, more consistent and—what is even more welcome—briefer than the rest, wants honest, informal discussion between the four heads of government, not with the purpose of placing a diktat before the United Nations and the world, but in the hope of working out a fair accommodation of middle eastern problems for that body's consideration.

Prime Minister Macmillan is more subtle. He wants the same thing as General de Gaulle, but the British feel that they could never have persuaded the President to get near the summit unless they involved the move in the United Nations. So they are talking a great deal about the United Nations while actually hoping for precisely those decisions in a smoke-filled room (politely called recommendations) that Secretary Dulles is trying to avoid.

What astonishes the United States allies, and particularly the logical French, is why Washington is so brave about committing the person and prestige of the President of the United States to a public wrangle with Mr. Khrushchev in the Security Council while hesitating about serious talks in private.

Why, they ask, have the heads of government gone to all the trouble of engaging in a public debate about past military action in the Middle East—an exercise that can be carried on with less danger by the permanent delegates at the United Nations—and then shying away from private efforts to reach a just settlement of the root problems that led to that military action?

This, too, is the position taken by Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of the United Nations. He is not afraid that the government chiefs will bring any decision out of private talks and try to impose it on the United Nations and the middle eastern powers. He does not believe that talking with Mr. Khrushchev equals capitulating to him.

But he is afraid that a public exchange of charges between the heads of government would inflame world tensions. It is not smoke in New York he fears, but fire in the Middle East.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it occurs to me that Premier de Gaulle and Mr. Reston have clearly set forth reasons why it would be wise for the Department of State and, indeed, the President to reconsider their apparent determination to forestall any serious present effort to ease international tension through private conversations at the highest level.

#### SENATE PROCEDURE, BY CHARLES L. WATKINS AND FLOYD M. RIDDICK, PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some weeks ago each of us received a handsomely bound volume entitled "Senate Procedure." The authors of this book are Mr. Charles L. Watkins, our experienced and wise Parliamentarian, and Mr. Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian.

Some favorable comment about the book took place in the Senate at the time of its publication. I have delayed my own observations until I have had time to study the contents.

Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick are to be congratulated upon the thoroughness, the clarity, and the exhaustive citations which characterize this splendid volume.

As a relatively new Member of the Senate, I can state that my knowledge of the Senate and its traditions, procedures, and rules is certainly the greater today for having studied and read the book entitled "Senate Procedure."

We are fortunate to have on our Senate staff scholars with the energy, ambition, and knowledge to produce an authoritative volume of this caliber.

Each of us, I understand, has received two extra copies of Senate Procedure. I have put mine to the best possible use. I have sent them to the Honorable Boyd Overhulse, of Madras, Oreg., President of the Oregon State Senate, where once I had the honor to serve, and to the Honorable Walter J. Pearson, of Portland, Oreg., who very probably will be elected President of the Oregon State Senate in January of 1959.

These two able State senators undoubtedly will profit as presiding officers through the reading of Senate Procedure in the United States Senate by our skilled and able parliamentarians, Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick.

Furthermore, I compliment Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick upon the outstanding quality of the writing in their book. If the purpose of words is to convey meaning—as I believe it is—these two men have skillfully avoided ambiguities and vagueness, and have made abundantly clear the information which they seek to disseminate. In addition, the book is well printed by our Government Printing Office and is tastefully bound in dignified black leather. I hope that some of our national periodicals like the New York Times Book Review and the Saturday Review will accord this book the distinction it merits, and that it will be reviewed in their columns.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. BETTS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3651) to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes, vice Mr. KILBURN excused.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Wadiha Salime Hamade, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. CHELF, and Mr. HYDE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7898. An act to revise the authorization with respect to the charging of tolls on the bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; and

H. R. 10805. An act for the relief of certain persons who sustained damages by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13549) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 495. An act to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2767. An act to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records;

H. R. 8826. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office;

H. R. 9196. An act to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10805. An act for the relief of certain persons who sustained damages by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods;

H. R. 11805. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 12140. An act to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12850. An act to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13138. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, to provide for more effective integration of a fish and wildlife conservation program with Federal water-resource developments, and for other purposes.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13549) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.



# BACKGROUND TO THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE: REMEMBER THE RECORD OF APPEASEMENT OF THE 1930'S; REMEMBER THE RECORD OF SOVIET TREATY VIOLATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day, when speaking on the floor of the Senate, I cautioned the people of the United States, and of the world, not to permit themselves to be lulled to sleep by the mistaken notion that a summit conference with the Soviet Union will miraculously solve world problems.

I pointed out that, first, in the past, there have been many summit conferences with Soviet Russia; second, virtually every agreement reached at those summit conferences was subsequently violated by the Soviet Union.

Do we have any reason, therefore, to expect that, this time, the postsummit results will be any different?

I am not arguing against holding a summit conference, as such.

On the contrary, I believe that (a) if there are proper procedural safeguards, such as President Eisenhower has outlined, and (b) if the Free World is truly awake to the dangers, then the hazards of a summit conference can be minimized.

## THE PRESIDENT'S LATEST LETTER CONFIRMS UNITED STATES SINCERITY ON SUMMIT

President Eisenhower's latest letter to Khrushchev is a masterpiece of straightforward, specific, clear-cut comment. The President debunks the Soviet charge that we are allegedly dragging our feet, so far as holding the summit conference is concerned.

The President affirmatively outlines, in an absolute, open and aboveboard way, his personal intention to participate, his invitation for Khrushchev to participate, and the need for clear-cut conditions for the conference.

The letter confirms what the President has so frequently stated, namely, that the United States will sincerely leave no stone unturned in seeking a sound basis for possible East-West settlement. But the President's model of forthrightness does not in any way alter the fact that the President knows, as all should know, that the past record of postsummit results has been studded with Soviet violations.

## ALLIES FOOLING THEMSELVES ABOUT DIPLOMATIC MIRACLES

Unfortunately, many of our allies have ignored that past record. Some of our allies seem to have taken, in effect, tranquilizer pills. They have been putting themselves half to sleep. They have been singing to themselves a Soviet peace lullaby, as if a summit conference were going to settle the cold war. Unfortunately, it probably will result in no such thing. It may be a propaganda circus, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, unless strictest procedures are followed. Even then, the Soviet Union may utterly abuse the world's earnest desire for a real diplomatic parley.

President Eisenhower has been right, therefore, in cautioning the world against overconfidence in the results of the summit conference.

## SOVIET RECORD OF 1,000 TREATY VIOLATIONS

I personally invite my colleagues' attention to Senate Document No. 125,

entitled "Soviet Political Agreements and Results." This document, 63 pages long, was published in 1956 by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It contained a list of 1,000 or so Soviet bilateral and multilateral agreements signed with the other nations of the world. A staff analysis of all of those agreements shows that in the short years since the Soviet Union came into existence in 1917, "its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it had ever given a signed promise."

I ask our allies: Are we, then, gullibly to collect more worthless Soviet signatures at the summit? Are we, then, to fool ourselves into believing that Mr. Khrushchev is suddenly going to change his Government's habits?

## SPECIFIC RED VIOLATIONS

Are we to fail to remember that Mr. Khrushchev has the same attitude that Kaiser Wilhelm I had; namely, that "a treaty is but a scrap of paper"?

What treaties has Russia violated?

First. Analysis has shown that she has violated 50 of her 52 major agreements with us.

Second. The Senate Judiciary Committee study listed, as I have indicated, 1,000 treaties and agreements signed by Russia, virtually every one of which was broken.

When Russia invaded Finland, she violated the League of Nations Covenant. Russia violated the Kellogg-Briand Pact. She violated the United Nations Charter. She adhered to the Atlantic Charter; then violated it. She violated the Potsdam Agreement. She violated the Cairo Agreement. She violated the Tehran Agreement. She violated the Geneva Agreement.

## NEED FOR IRONCLAD INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

Is it any wonder, therefore, that we have insisted time and again that it is useless to sign an agreement with Russia unless there is an ironclad step-by-step inspection system or enforcement system?

Is it any wonder that we have tried to warn the other peoples of the world not to "build themselves up" once more to an "awful letdown"?

## CAIRO MAY BE TRYING TO IMITATE STALIN-HITLER RECORD

The fact is, Mr. President, that the Soviet record of treaty violations, while a source of disgust to us, has become, perhaps, a model example for some other unscrupulous powers.

I wonder to what extent the powers that be in Cairo think they can duplicate the Soviet record? I wonder how far they think they can go in trying to get away with treaty violations and falsification? Does Cairo think it can imitate the successful record of Adolf Hitler from 1933 to 1939?

What was that record?

It was a record of, first, one treaty violation after another; second, one demand for appeasement after another; and, third, one pledge after another that if appeased just once more there would be no more demands.

Today, step by step, Cairo seems to be making demands upon the world—

always apparently promising to act in good faith if its one more request is respected.

## APPEASEMENT OF CAIRO WILL NOT WORK

Mr. President, I say that appeasement of Cairo will not work in 1958 any more than appeasement of Adolf Hitler worked in the 1930's.

I say that an aggressor who tries to win unjust spoils becomes bigger and stronger, step by step, after each uncontested violation. An aggressor plays on the gullibility of others, upon their desire for peace and stability. He strings them along, always luring them deeper and deeper into his trap.

I send to the desk a brief summary of how Hitler and his cohort, Mussolini, played this step-by-step game of stringing along their foes in the 1930's. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE RECORD OF THE 1930'S: STEP-BY-STEP VIOLATION AND APPEASEMENT

January 30, 1933: Hitler scrapped the Versailles Treaty by rearming immediately after coming into power.

October 3, 1935: Mussolini violated the League of Nations Charter and invaded Ethiopia.

March 7, 1936: Hitler violated the Locarno Pact by remilitarizing the Rhineland.

July 18, 1936: Hitler and Mussolini violated nonintervention agreements by intervening in the Spanish Civil War.

March 11, 1938: Hitler violated Austrian sovereignty by invading Austria.

September 30, 1938: Hitler violated Czechoslovakian sovereignty by obtaining the Sudetenland at Munich.

March 15, 1939: Hitler violated the Munich Agreement by invading Czechoslovakia.

April 7, 1939: Mussolini violated Albania's sovereignty by invading Albania.

September 1, 1939: Hitler violated Polish sovereignty by invading Poland.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was asked, "Senator, why do you make these remarks?"

Mr. President, I make them because of the situation which exists at this time. Only this morning, I heard—over the television—reports to the effect that people of practically all countries are, because of their deep hunger and desire for peace, virtually forcing their leaders to the summit, and are expecting that by means of such a meeting, the millennium—peace—will arrive.

But, Mr. President, as I have stated, at the same time, in my humble opinion, those who expect such a result are but building themselves up for a letdown.

A mental letdown is bad enough; but if other peoples begin to believe that peace is just around the corner, that will be exactly what the Kremlin wants, for the leaders in the Kremlin want the people of other countries to fall asleep—as the people of the United States did at the time of Pearl Harbor, and as the people of England did at the time when Chamberlain returned from Munich and said "I have gotten peace in our time."

Mr. President, that must not occur again.

So, to the people of this land, I say that I trust they will carefully consider what

I have said. My message to them is: Awake, America, awake. Beware of taking pills that would put you to sleep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4208) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for construction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make in connection with the bill.

Senate bill 4208 represents the first piece of proposed legislation to come before the Senate which is required by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. The purpose of the bill is to authorize capital expenditures in the amount of \$47,800,000 for the new space agency during the fiscal year 1959.

The committee heard in detail from Dr. Dryden, the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, who testified in support of the requests for the authorizations contained in the bill; and the committee then ordered it reported, without objection. The Appropriations Committee has similarly heard, from representatives of the executive branch, testimony in favor of appropriations to carry out the purposes of the bill.

In brief, Senate bill 4208 authorizes appropriations of \$24,500,000 for expansion of the existing facility at Wallops Island, Va., where the launching of small rockets now takes place. The bill also authorizes appropriations of \$3,750,000 for a space project center in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., and appropriations of \$19,550,000 for equipment and instrumentation at various locations and installations now operated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which soon will become a part of the new Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Congress has acted with both speed and great care in setting up the executive and legislative organizations for dealing with the space age. All of us are familiar with the civilian and military benefits which can flow from a vigorous space program.

The capital expenditure requests made by the executive branch, and dealt with in this bill will contribute to our efforts to accelerate civilian experimentation and exploration in space technology; and it is with strong convictions that the committee urges favorable action by the Senate on the bill, so we may proceed without any delay with our space program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4208) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of \$47,800,000 for acquisition or condemnation of real property, for plant and facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other items of a capital nature as follows:

Pilotless aircraft station, Wallops Island, Va.: Additional launching facilities; range control and administration building; shop and laboratory facilities; roads, causeway, bridges, seawall, and appurtenances; utilities; equipment and instrumentation; and approximately 3,400 acres of land, \$24,500,000.

Space projects center, vicinity of Washington, D. C.: Space projects building; research projects laboratory; roads and appurtenances; utilities; equipment and instrumentation, \$3,750,000.

Various locations: Equipment and instrumentation, \$19,550,000.

Sec. 2. Any of the amounts enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed \$47,800,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2077, S. 4021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4021) to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins, and intervening areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 3, line 2, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "9"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "of", to insert "existing Federal"; after line 6, to insert:

(5) to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple purpose projects.

In line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven"; on page 5, line 6, after the word "States", to insert "except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this act without prejudice to his retired status, and, he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$12,000 in any one calendar year;"; in line 14, after "(2)", to strike out "Five" and insert "Six"; in line 18, after the name "Agriculture", to insert "one from the Department of Interior"; on page 7, line 6, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; in line 7, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "9"; in line 18, after the word "necessary", to strike out "transmit in the mails, free of postage, under cover of a penalty envelope, matters which relate exclusively to the business of the Commission" and insert "use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as Departments and agencies of the United States Government"; on page 8, line 10, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed"; in line 19, after the word "travel", to insert "in accordance with standardized Government Travel Regulations"; at the top of page 9, to insert:

Sec. 5. Responsibility shall be vested in the Chairman for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds: *Provided*, That in carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission.

At the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "6" to "7"; in line 16, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; in line 22, after the word "are", to strike out "directed" and insert "authorized"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "and estimates of contributions that may be required from power revenues to return reimbursable costs of present and prospective projects that are beyond the ability of water users, or drainage beneficiaries to pay;"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 20, after "Stat.", to strike out "887);" and insert "887)."; after line 20, to strike out:

(3) Proposals for the acquisition of a right to the use of water and the regulation of its appropriation and distribution for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes shall be in conformity with applicable State laws;

(4) Any such plan shall recognize and give full effect to existing interstate compacts relating to the land and water resources of the basins referred to in this act;

(5) Federal projects now constructed and in operation, or under construction, or authorized for construction, or which may be authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before Congress, if in compliance with the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction



of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 837), shall not be altered, changed, restricted or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this act.

On page 13, at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; in line 16, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; in line 18, after the name "President", to strike out "and the Congress"; on page 14, after line 7, to strike out:

(b) If, within 2 years from the date of its organization, the Commission, after complying with subsection (a) of this section, shall have been unable to agree unanimously upon and to submit to the President and to the Congress a plan as hereinbefore provided, then the Commission shall, within 6 months thereafter, submit to the President and to the Congress (1) such plan as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of the members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act; or (2) in the event plan receiving the favorable vote of a majority of such members referred to in clause (1) of this subsection does not receive the favorable vote of a majority of the whole Commission, then the Commission shall submit vote (A) such plan as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of such members referred to in clause (1) of this subsection, and (B) such plan, if any, as shall have received the favorable vote of a majority of the members of the whole Commission.

At the top of page 15, to insert:

(c) The President shall, within 90 days after the receipt by him of the final report of the Commission, transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

At the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; and, after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 9. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is—

(a) to provide for an integrated and co-operative investigation, study, and survey by a commission created pursuant to this act and composed of representatives of certain departments and agencies of the United States, and of certain States enumerated in this section, in connection with, and in promotion of, the conservation, utilization, and development of the land and water resources of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama in order to formulate a comprehensive and coordinated plan for—

- (1) flood control and prevention;
- (2) domestic and municipal water supplies;
- (3) the improvement and safeguarding of navigation;
- (4) the reclamation and irrigation of land, including drainage;
- (5) possibilities of hydroelectric power and industrial development and utilization;
- (6) soil conservation and utilization;
- (7) forest conservation and utilization;

- (8) preservation, protection, and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources;
- (9) the development of recreation;
- (10) salinity and sediment control;
- (11) pollution abatement and the protection of public health; and
- (12) such other beneficial and useful purposes not herein enumerated; and

(b) to formulate, within the time provided for in section 9 of this act, a basic, comprehensive and integrated plan of development of the land and water resources within the area described in this section for submission to, and consideration by, the President and the Congress, and to make recommendations, after adequate study, for executing and keeping current such plan. It is not the purpose of this act to create any continuing or permanent instrumentality of the Federal Government or to take from, or reassign, the duties and powers of any department or agency of the United States represented on the Commission, except as herein provided in this act.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this act it shall be the policy of Congress to—

(1) recognize and protect the rights and interests of the States in determining the development of the watersheds of the rivers herein mentioned and their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as well as the preservation and protection of established uses;

(2) protect existing and authorized projects and projects under construction whether public or private;

(3) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and continuing investigational programs of the departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States;

(4) recognize an important body of existing Federal law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, flood control, grazings, geological survey, national parks, mines, and minerals; and

(5) to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple purpose projects.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins and intervening areas hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 11 members appointed by the President as follows:

(1) One member, who shall serve as Chairman, and who shall be a resident from the area comprising the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) embraced within the States referred to in the first section of this act and who shall not, during the period of his service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this act without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$12,000 in any one calendar year;

(2) Six members, of whom one shall be from the Department of the Army, one from the Department of Commerce, one from the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one from the Department of Agriculture, one from the Department of Interior, and one from the Federal Power Commission; and

(3) Four members, upon the recommendation and nomination, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, of the respective governors of each of the following States: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

(c) In the event of the failure of the governor of any of the States referred to in subsection (b) of this section to recommend and nominate a person or persons in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section satisfactory to the President within 60 days after a request by the President for such recommendation and nomination, the President shall then select and appoint a qualified resident from such State which failed to submit a satisfactory recommendation and nomination.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Within 30 days after the appointment of the members of the Commission by the President, and funds have been made available by the Congress as provided for in this act, the Commission shall organize for the performance of its functions.

(f) The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Six members of the Commission, of whom at least three shall have been appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(h) Members of the Commission shall report from time to time to their respective departments or agencies, or to their respective governors if appointed pursuant to subsection (b) (3) or (c) of this section, on the work of the Commission, and any comments and suggestions pertaining to such work from such departments, agencies, or governors shall be placed before the Commission for its consideration.

(i) The Commission shall cease to exist within 3 months from the date of its submission to the President of its final report as provided for in section 9 of this act. All property, assets, and records of the Commission shall thereupon be turned over for liquidation and disposition to such agency or agencies in the executive branch as the President shall designate.

SEC. 4. The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, administer such oaths, and publish so much of its proceedings and the reports thereon as it may deem advisable; lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States Government; have printing and binding done in its discretion by establishments other than the Government Printing Office; employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; purchase or hire, operate, maintain, and dispose of such vehicles as it may require; secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commis-

sion, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, and employees of the departments or agencies from which persons have been appointed to the Commission pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act may be assigned upon request by the Chairman of the Commission to temporary duty with the Commission without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status; pay travel in accordance with standardized Government Travel Regulations and other necessary expenses incurred by it, or any of its officers or employees, in the performance of duties vested in such Commission; and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform the functions vested in such Commission under this act.

Sec. 5. Responsibility shall be vested in the Chairman for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission, (2) the distribution of business among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds: *Provided*, That in carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission.

Sec. 6. (a) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act, shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties, but the aggregate compensation received by the members of the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$12,000 per annum in the case of the Chairman, and \$7,500 per annum in the case of members of the Commission other than those members appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of this act.

Sec. 7. In the formulation of a comprehensive and coordinated plan or plans for (a) the control, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas), (b) conservation and development of the land resources of such area; (c) flood control, navigation, reclamation, agriculture purposes, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and (d) such other needs as are set forth in paragraph (a) of the first section of this act, the Commission shall—

(1) seek to secure maximum public benefits for the region and the Nation consistent with the specific directions contained in section 8 and elsewhere in this act;

(2) utilize the services, studies, surveys, and reports of existing Government agencies and shall encourage the completion of such current and additional studies and investigations by such agencies as will further the purposes of this act, and such agencies are authorized to cooperate within the limits of available funds and personnel to the end that the Commission may carry out its functions as expeditiously as possible;

(3) take into consideration the financial, physical, and economic benefits of existing and prospective Federal works constructed or to be constructed consistent with the purposes of this act;

(4) include in its plan or plans estimated costs and benefits; recommendations relating to the establishment of pay-out schedules (areawide or otherwise) taking into account the Federal Government's present and prospective investment in the area; costs reimbursable and nonreimbursable; sources for reimbursement; returns heretofore made from existing projects and estimates of returns from recommended projects; repayment schedules for water, irrigation, industrial, and other uses; power rates and recommendations for the marketing thereof in such manner as to encourage its most widespread use at the lowest possible rates consistent with the return of capital investment and interest thereon;

(5) offer in its plan or plans proposals for the construction and operation of the projects contained therein, and designate the functions and activities of the various Federal departments and agencies in connection therewith consistent with existing law, except that no such plan or plans shall include final project designs and estimates.

Sec. 8. In the formulation of its plan or plans and in the preparation of its report to the President and to the Congress, the Commission shall comply with the following directives:

(1) The report shall contain the basic comprehensive plan for the development of the water and land resources of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins (and intervening areas) formulated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of, and to accomplish the purposes of, this act;

(2) The Commission and the participating Federal departments and agencies shall comply substantially with the intent, purposes, and procedure set forth in the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

Sec. 9. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to prepare a final report, within the time provided for in this section, for submission to the President. Before the Commission takes final action on the approval of such report for submission to the President, it shall transmit a copy of such report to each department, agency, and governor referred to in subsection (b) of section 3 of this act. Within 90 days from the date of receipt by each such department, agency, and governor of such proposed report, the written views, comments, and recommendations of such department, agency, and governor shall be submitted to the Commission. The Commission may adopt in its report to the President and to the Congress any views, comments, and recommendations so submitted and change its report accordingly. The Commission shall transmit to the President, with its final report, the submitted views, comments, and recommendations of each such department, agency, and governor whether or not adopted by such Commission.

(c) The President shall, within 90 days after the receipt by him of the final report of the Commission, transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

(d) The final report of the Commission and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

Sec. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the establishment of a United States Study Commission which would be responsible for the preparation of integrated and cooperative investigations, studies, and surveys of land and water resources in the southeastern portion of

the country. The area encompassed for the study includes that portion of the southeast drainage basins which would be bounded on the northeast by the Savannah River Basin, on the south by the St. Marys-Nassau River Basin and on the west by the Alabama-Coosa River Basin system.

The Study Commission would be empowered to prepare plans for development of land and water resources of the area and to submit a report on such plans to the President. The Study Commission would be composed of 11 members who would be appointed by the President; 6 members would be from Federal departments; 4 members from the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. The Chairman, who would be the 11th member, would be a resident of one of the States embraced within the study area.

The Commission would cease to exist within 3 months from the date of its submission of its final report to the President and the President shall, within 90 days after receipt of the final report transmit it to Congress with his views, comments, and recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4021) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CLAIM OF AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1850, S. 552.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 552) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the measure is before the Senate at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He has discussed it with the leadership on both sides several times. We have agreed to schedule the bill for prompt action. It seems the most convenient time to do it is now.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the claimant as the result of the performance of a contract numbered VAc-1185, dated July 25, 1941, entered into with the Veterans' Administration.



The proposed legislation provides that, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and that proceedings for the determination of the claim and review of it, and payment of any judgment, shall be had as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code—claims against the United States generally.

The proposed legislation further provides that nothing contained in it shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

I am informed the bill was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. The senior Senator from New Jersey is very much interested in it. I hope it may be acted upon at this time.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 552) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the said Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J., as the result of the performance of a contract No. VAC-1185, dated July 25, 1941, entered into with the Veterans' Administration.

**SEC. 2.** Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

**SEC. 3.** Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

#### AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT, 1916

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

**Mr. JOHNSON** of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 3916.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3916) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 14 of the Shipping Act, 1916, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That nothing in this section or elsewhere in this act, shall be construed or applied to forbid or make unlawful any dual rate contract arrangement in use by the members of a conference on May 19, 1958, which conference is organized under an agreement approved under section 15 of this act by the regulatory body administering this act, unless and until such regu-

latory body disapproves, cancels, or modifies such arrangement in accordance with the standards set forth in section 15 of this act. The term 'dual rate contract arrangement' as used herein means a practice whereby a conference establishes tariffs of rates at two levels the lower of which will be charged to merchants who agree to ship their cargoes on vessels of members of the conference only and the higher of which shall be charged to merchants who do not so agree."

**SEC. 2.** This act shall be effective immediately upon enactment and shall cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1960.

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the House amendment, which merely changes the effective date of the bill, and which is agreeable to all members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

This bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that nothing in the Shipping Act of 1916 shall be construed to forbid or make unlawful any dual rate contract arrangement in effect at the time of enactment of the bill by members of a steamship conference organized pursuant to section 15 of the act. The bill is of a temporary nature and would continue in effect only until June 30, 1960, thus providing time for a thorough consideration of the procedures necessary to resolve the dislocation resulting from a Supreme Court decision of May 19, 1958. In that decision the Court declared illegal the dual-rate contract system of the Japan-Atlantic and Gulf freight conference.

The House amended the Senate bill so as to cover only dual-rate contract arrangements in effect on the date of the Supreme Court decision rather than those in effect on the date of enactment of this bill. In other words, any dual-rate contract arrangement entered into between the date of the Court decision and the date of passage of this bill would not be affected by this legislation, but would be subject to the Court decision.

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

**Mr. JOHNSON** of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1669, S. 3493.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 3493) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

**Mr. JOHNSON** of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMPENSATION TO CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS FOR CERTAIN CEDED LANDS

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will oblige me, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2116, H. R. 11722.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H. R. 11722) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 20, line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "act:" and insert "act, together with interest which would have been earned in accordance with law on such revenues had they been deposited in the trust funds of the tribe, as received."

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the bill was reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously. The bill passed the House in the same fashion.

**Mr. President,** I ask unanimous consent that a statement relative to the measure under consideration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes.

There is to be hereby authorized to be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds now or hereafter made available to the Bureau of Reclamation and to be placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and expended for its benefit and the benefit of its members, pursuant to existing law, a sum of money as provided by the bill. If the payment offered by the Secretary of the Interior for the land to be taken is not accepted within 60 days, the Secretary or the Crow Tribe is authorized to commence in a court of competent jurisdiction an action for determining the just compensation payable for such taking. The fair market value of, and the just compensation payable for, the Indian interest in the lands taken shall not include any value attributable to the construction and development by the United States of the Huntley reclamation project.

The perimeter boundaries of the tract of land which are also the proposed exterior

boundaries of the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, are described in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### DISPLAY PASTURE FOR BISON HERD ON THE MONTANA NATIONAL BISON RANGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2122, H. R. 3402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3402) to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the only bison range in the country is in the western part of the State of Nevada. It is a large spread.

This measure, which was introduced by my distinguished colleague in the other body, Representative METCALF, will provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range, so that the herd will be more open to the public and more easily seen. I hope this measure will receive the same unanimous agreement it received in the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3402) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. As I understand the Senate now automatically returns to consideration of the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3493) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enactment clause and insert:

That the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch.

3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 988), is further amended as follows:

Section 3 (c) (8) is amended by adding the following:

"iv. Any employer, at any time, may voluntarily pay into the unemployment compensation fund an amount in excess of the contributions required to be paid under the provisions of this act, and such amount shall be forthwith credited to his reserve account. His rate of contribution shall be computed, or recomputed, as the case may be, with such amount included in the calculation. To affect such employer's rate of contribution for any year, such amount shall be paid not later than 30 days following the mailing of notice of his rate of contribution for such year: *Provided*, That such amount, when paid as aforesaid, shall not be refunded or used as a credit in the payment of contributions in whole or in part."

Sec. 7. Section 7 of said act approved August 28, 1935, is amended—

(a) by striking table A in subsection (b) of said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Table A

"High-quarter wages (col. A)	Basic weekly benefit (col. B)	Minimum qualifying wages (col. C)
\$130.00 to \$184.....	8	276
\$184.01 to \$207.....	9	310
\$207.01 to \$230.....	10	345
\$230.01 to \$253.....	11	379
\$253.01 to \$276.....	12	414
\$276.01 to \$299.....	13	448
\$299.01 to \$322.....	14	483
\$322.01 to \$345.....	15	517
\$345.01 to \$368.....	16	552
\$368.01 to \$391.....	17	586
\$391.01 to \$414.....	18	621
\$414.01 to \$437.....	19	655
\$437.01 to \$460.....	20	690
\$460.01 to \$483.....	21	724
\$483.01 to \$506.....	22	759
\$506.01 to \$529.....	23	793
\$529.01 to \$552.....	24	828
\$552.01 to \$575.....	25	862
\$575.01 to \$598.....	26	897
\$598.01 to \$621.....	27	931
\$621.01 to \$644.....	28	966
\$644.01 to \$667.....	29	1,000
\$667.01 to \$690.....	30	1,035
\$690.01 to \$713.....	31	1,069
\$713.01 to \$736.....	32	1,104
\$736.01 to \$759.....	33	1,138
\$759.01 to \$782.....	34	1,173
\$782.01 to \$805.....	35	1,207
\$805.01 to \$828.....	36	1,242
\$828.01 to \$851.....	37	1,276
\$851.01 to \$874.....	38	1,311
\$874.01 to \$897.....	39	1,345
\$897.01 to \$920.....	40	1,380
\$920.01 to \$943.....	41	1,414
\$943.01 to \$966.....	42	1,449
\$966.01 to \$989.....	43	1,483
\$989.01 to \$1,012.....	44	1,518
\$1,012.01 to \$1,035.....	45	1,552
\$1,035.01 to \$1,058.....	46	1,587
\$1,058.01 to \$1,081.....	47	1,621
\$1,081.01 and over.....	48	1,656

(b) by striking out subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) any otherwise eligible individual shall be entitled during any benefit year to a total amount of benefits equal to 34 times his weekly benefit amount."

(c) striking the figure "\$30" at the end of the first sentence of subsection (f) of section 7 and inserting the figure "\$48" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 3. Section 10 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An individual who has left his most recent work voluntarily without good cause, as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such leaving occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week."

Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An individual who has been discharged for misconduct occurring in the course of his most recent work proved to the

satisfaction of the Board shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such discharge occurred and for the 6 weeks of consecutive unemployment immediately following such week."

Section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If an individual otherwise eligible for benefits fails, without good cause as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, either to apply for new work found by the Board to be suitable when notified by any employment office, or to accept any suitable work when offered to him by any employment office, his union hiring hall, or any employer direct, he shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such failure occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week. In determining whether or not work is suitable within the meaning of this subsection the Board shall consider (1) the physical fitness and prior training, experience, and earnings of the individual, (2) the distance of the place of work from the individual's place of residence, and (3) the risk involved as to health, safety, or morals."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the next succeeding calendar quarter following its enactment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate, S. 3493, bears the bill number of the measure which I introduced on March 14, 1958, but, in the course of hearings held before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, on April 21, 1958, and during the markup of the bill in executive session, modifications were made. I concurred in the modifications. Among the modifications made was the addition of the first section of the bill as it now reads.

This section, which is a decided improvement in the law from the standpoint of the employer, safeguards the experience rating of employers who, under it, will be permitted to make voluntary payments into the fund in order to avert a percentage raise in their contributions to the fund. In passing, I might add, this feature of the bill received the endorsement of the Washington Board of Trade in testimony before the committee—pages 51 and 96 of the printed hearings—and it also is contained in a measure introduced in the other body by Representative McMILLAN, H. R. 10625.

Section 2 of the bill, as reported, accomplishes two main purposes: First, it raises the number of weeks for which an eligible unemployed benefit claimant may receive payment from the present 26-week maximum to a 34-week maximum; and, second, it increases the weekly benefit amount from the present maximum of \$30 to \$48 a week.

With regard to the first point, the extension from 26 weeks to 34 weeks, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this represents less than what was adopted earlier in the session under the provisions of H. R. 12065, which became Public Law 85-441. In that act, benefits can now be claimed for 39 weeks by those who are covered by its provisions. The net effect of adoption and enactment of the pending measure will be to limit the District in being able to borrow for payments to eligible claimants to 5 weeks,



the difference between the 39-week limitation of Public Law 85-441 and the 34-week limitation contained in this bill.

I might also point out, Mr. President, that the recommendation of the Rockefeller report, contained in Special Studies Report IV, pages 12 and 13, is:

This panel has endorsed above the temporary supplement to unemployment insurance benefits. At the same time we recommend the following permanent improvements:

(3) The lengthening of the maximum duration of benefits to something like 39 weeks.

It is appreciated that there may be those who, in all sincerity, view with great caution the extension of benefits for the full 39-week period. I personally believe that they are exercised over a scarecrow argument which will be found to have little substance in the actual operation of the program. Since I am convinced that eventually these men, with whom I have an honest difference on this point, will come to accept the full 39-week duration as desirable, I am willing at this session to accept the 34-week provision. I hasten to add, Mr. President, that in reporting this bill to the Senate, a majority of the committee, including members on both sides of the aisle, agreed upon this uniform 34-week extension.

In a similar manner, through negotiation in committee, the maximum benefit figure of \$48 was arrived at as a basis which could command bipartisan support on the floor of the Senate. In this connection, and in further justification of the \$48 a week benefit figure, I should like to invite to the attention of the Senate pages 6 and 7 of the report which accompanied the bill to the floor. The report sets forth the historic formula used in computing the benefit amount at the inception of the unemployment compensation program in 1938. It was then three-fifths of the weekly wage; \$48 a week now for non-Federal workers meets that test. It should also be pointed out that the maximum benefit is not received by every claimant. In order to receive the \$48 amount, the eligible claimant must have received an average weekly wage of \$80 or more in his 13-week high-quarter period and have earned in the preceding benefit year at least \$1,656. The \$48-a-week figure will also meet the recommendations of the Rockefeller report, to which I have previously alluded. That document, on page 14, states under recommendations:

(2) The increase of insurance benefits to cushion more adequately the loss of wages during unemployment and provide purchasing power to counteract recession.

At the time the bill was before us in committee, the Federal pay raise of 10 percent had not yet been enacted. Since its enactment, we can be sure that the average wage in the District of all workers has risen from the \$91 to \$92 weekly figure by an additional \$5 or \$6. The \$48 week average figure of this bill will, therefore, come within the recommendations of the President with regard to unemployment compensation. In this connection, I refer the Senate to page 148 of the printed hearings, which contains a

quotation from a letter sent by the then Secretary of Labor to all State governors under date of November 27, 1954. This reads:

You will recall the goals suggested by the President for improvement of the benefit provisions of the unemployment-insurance laws. He suggested that the States raise their dollar maximums so that the payments to the great majority of beneficiaries may equal at least half their regular earnings. In order to achieve this goal, it is our belief that the maximum benefit level, which is the principal limiting factor on weekly benefits, should be geared to the average gross earnings of all workers covered by the program, not just of those who are drawing benefits at any particular time. Weekly benefit amounts beneath this maximum should be at least 50 percent of the workers' gross earnings in covered employment.

I come now, Mr. President, to the final point on this measure, the section 3 amendments which deal with replacing the present variable disqualification provisions by a uniform 6-week disqualification. These three changes in section 10 of the present law were contained in the original bill which I introduced, and they were also a part of the bill introduced by the ranking Republican on the committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. A full discussion of these changes will be found on pages 12 and 13 of the report on the bill. The changes recommended by the committee are endorsed by the Department of Labor, and in this connection I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the portion of the Secretary of Labor's letter of April 2, 1957, which dealt with these provisions. He said in the communication:

Present disqualification provisions are excessively stringent for inclusion in a sound unemployment-insurance program. An individual who voluntarily quits work, is discharged by reason of misconduct, or refuses to accept suitable work, may be disqualified for a period of not less than 4 nor more than 9 weeks, depending upon the discretion of the administrative official handling the claim. I believe that a disqualification should run only for that period during which unemployment can be said to be attributed to his disqualifying act. Studies have shown that in a normal labor market a person actively looking for work will find employment within 6 weeks. Therefore, unemployment continuing for more than 6 weeks cannot fairly be said to have any relation to any previous acts of the worker. S. 1214 would provide a uniform 6-week disqualification period.

The present law in effect imposes a second penalty based on the same act which postpones qualification for benefits. This is in the form of a reduction in total benefits payable in any one year equal to the number of weeks of disqualification multiplied by the weekly benefit amount. I believe that this second penalty is inequitable and that the 6-week disqualification period discussed above is all that is necessary to discourage those who might otherwise be tempted to take advantage of the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. President, in concluding my opening statement on S. 3493, I urge that the Senate pass this proposed legislation. It is not new legislation or theoretical legislation. Rather, in the best sense of the word, it is conservative legislation. It seeks to conserve, through renovation, sound principles of unemployment compensation, adopted over two decades ago,

which are part of the American tradition in social legislation.

By increasing the amount of benefits, we are but returning to the proportion of the weekly wage that the benefit once represented. By increasing the duration of benefits by 8 weeks, we are but assuring that the mass purchasing power upon which our total economy is based shall be preserved, in part, for the time necessary to permit remedial action to be taken in the event that widespread unemployment should occur, and to carry through the families who need assistance until employment is regained. The uniform disqualification provisions are but the correction of an existing inequity which, when enacted, will remove from arbitrary and subjective administrative discretion application of penalties, thus replacing administrative uncertainty with law, precise and definite.

I thank the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. CLARK] for the great assistance he was to me, as chairman of the subcommittee, in connection with devising an agreed program within our committee which I could bring to the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I thank the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], for the great assistance he was in obtaining within the committee agreement which permitted us to bring this substantial majority report to the Senate.

I also wish to thank the ranking Republican member of the committee [Mr. BEALL] for the great assistance he was to me as chairman of the subcommittee.

This is a fair, reasonable, and needed bill, and I hope the Senate will pass it forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS—ENDORSEMENT OF POSITION OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD two letters, one dated July 19, 1958, and the other dated July 22, 1958, accompanied by certain resolutions which were adopted at the annual conference of the Committee on World Peace of the Methodist Church in my State, in support of the position which I have taken in opposition to the administration's policy in sending marines to the Middle East.

There being no objection, the letters and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE,  
Portland, Oreg., July 19, 1958.  
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With thousands of fellow Oregonians, I want to thank you for your usual forthright stand in regard to the Middle East crisis. I am sure you have voiced the unexpressed convictions of the people not only of the State but of the Nation in opposing the sending of troops to Lebanon. The TV commentators on the spot and in Washington and New York seem to reflect the same feeling in somewhat guarded language.

As I reported to you last August 7 (thank you for the fine dinner), I was able to observe something of Arab nationalism first hand last July, when I traveled through Egypt and Jordan as well as Israel. I fear that the landing of the marines and paratroopers will only increase Arab resentment against the United States (even on the part of those who wanted American help and protection, as a CBS commentator in Lebanon said last night) and play into the hands of Nasser and the Soviet Union.

I do realize that the situation has been very difficult and that it has been complicated very gravely by the sending of American Armed Forces. But I do hope that the President and the Secretary of State will be able to devise ways of withdrawing the troops from Lebanon, with or without the loss of face. After all, saving face is a quaint oriental idiosyncrasy we can ill afford to indulge in. If we must, perhaps we can recognize the existence of the token United Nations observation force as a face-saving device to extricate ourselves from this impossible and increasingly embarrassing and dangerous position.

I hope and trust that you will continue to speak with conviction and forthrightness on this issue as you have done on others. We are very proud of the stand you and Congresswoman EITH GREEN and other Democratic representatives have taken on this issue. We depend on you to give continued leadership in the Nation when others seem to be so timid.

Sincerely yours,

HIDEO HASHIMOTO,  
Associate Professor of Religion,  
Chairman, Committee on World  
Peace, Oregon Annual Conference  
of the Methodist Church.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,  
OREGON CONFERENCE  
COORDINATING COUNCIL,  
Portland, Oreg., July 22, 1958.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wrote to you last Saturday supporting your position on the Middle East crisis. I should like to call your attention to the enclosed resolution of the report of the Committee on World Peace of the Oregon annual Methodist conference.

I want to call your attention particularly to Resolution No. 7 on world economic development and urge you to continue your admirable position in supporting the exten-

sion of trade agreements without weakening the amendments. Please keep up the good fight.

I want to call your attention, also, to the resolution passed by the (national) board of world peace of the Methodist Church meeting last November, "The United States can accomplish more for peace and democracy in the Middle East by sponsoring bold solutions to its economic and social problems through the U. N. than by sending arms to unstable governments."

We hope that the American troops will be withdrawn from Lebanon immediately.

Sincerely yours,

DR. HIDEO HASHIMOTO,  
Chairman of World Peace Committee,  
Oregon Annual Conference of the  
Methodist Church.

#### THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE

The role of the church in today's world situation is clear. Its task is to help mankind attain freedom, human rights, justice, adequate living standards, self-government, and the cooperation of all nations for the maintenance of peace.

With the development of increasingly horrible weapons of mass destruction, mankind stands at the threshold of possible extinction. In the face of this situation, Christians everywhere are confronted with a definite challenge.

Motivated and mobilized by the spirit of Christ and challenged by world conditions, Christians are in a strategic position to make the Gospel articulate in world affairs to the end that peace may become real and dynamic (par. 2024, 1956 Discipline).

#### RESOLUTIONS

1. Disarmament: We urge the United States Government to make persistent efforts to achieve universal disarmament through the United Nations. We further urge our Government to take decisive steps now in the direction of disarmament.

2. We urge discontinuance of nuclear-weapons testing by all nations and recommend instead the further development of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

3. Peacetime conscription: "We affirm the oft-stated position of the general conference that compulsory peacetime military training is contrary to the best American traditions and disregards the Christian hope for security through positive policies." (Annual meeting of the Board of World Peace, November 1957.) We urge the abolition of peacetime conscription.

4. We believe that the United Nations and its agencies should be supported, strengthened, and improved. Moreover, if these facilities are to become most effective, the United Nations, with membership open to all nations, must be given sufficient authority to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war. (Discipline, p. 2024, sec. 6.)

5. We believe that the United Nations is weakened by the absence of any government, especially those who wield effective power over great numbers of people. We, therefore, urge the recognition of the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic at the United Nations, provided steps have been taken to fulfill the responsibilities of the Free World, and the United States in particular, for the safety and well-being of refugees from the Chinese Communist dictatorship, especially in Formosa.

6. Political freedom: We believe in self-government, and the participation in political processes by all persons within a nation. (Annual meeting, Board of World Peace.)

7. World economic development: "We believe that the United States should give strong leadership to programs of world economic development. Our technical and capital assistance should be generous and ade-

quate. It should be largely channeled through the United Nations agencies, such as SUNFED, UNICEF, and the Technical Board. It should be linked to a continuation of reciprocal trade agreements and the ratification of the Organization to Trade Cooperations." (Annual meeting, Board of World Peace.)

8. Since the Methodist Church has been a strong supporter of democracy and freedom, and since other nations of the world interested in democracy and freedom have looked to America as an example to study and support, we urge our Congressmen and our State Department to discontinue political and military support of dictatorships.

9. We urge a continuation and expansion of the foreign exchange student program and urge Methodist churches to use the international students in some way to expand our knowledge and friendships of other peoples of the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from a representative of a group of farmers and neighbors who held a picnic in Oregon recently, and, as the writer of the letter says, changed the picnic into what proved to be a meeting in support of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon with regard to American policies involving the sending of Marines to the Middle East. I ask that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., July 21, 1958.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday, at a picnic farmers and neighbors in this area held here, it was decided to turn the affair into a goodwill picnic and express our appreciation to you for your commonsense stand in Washington on foreign affairs.

We appreciate very much the views you expressed in Congress, when you said it is a mistake for the United States to undertake unilaterally, or even in conjunction with Great Britain to interfere with every development in a world that appears to run counter to some interest of ours. We cannot direct to our own liking by force of arms all the forces of growth and change that are now on the loose in the Middle East, South America, or anywhere else.

After we had enjoyed our picnic repast, we drew up a little resolution on the Mideast crisis, and it was adopted, one and all. A copy is attached.

With the very best wishes from those at the picnic, I sign myself,

Sincerely and respectfully yours,  
EMIL HENDRICKSON.

Whereas a United Nations commission and U. N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld have indicated that the Government-change in Lebanon was a palace-type revolution; and

Whereas the sending of American marines, planes, and sections of our fleet to that area has alarmed the entire world, so that nations of such diverse political orientation as Japan, West Germany, India, People's Republic of China, and Sweden have criticized us for our unilateral action; and

Whereas this action can benefit no one except the Oil Trust, whose interests are not our interests, as witness the price we pay for gasoline; and at the least this action will hinder and impede the East-West efforts at Geneva to find some way of policing the



proposed nuclear bomb-test ban; and at the worst will set the clock hands of history back to Hiroshima, with disastrous consequences to mankind: Now, therefore, we 53 residents of Clatsop County, assembled at a goodwill picnic on this Sunday, the 20th of July 1958, urge:

Removal from Lebanon of the marines and from office of John Foster Dulles; and of interference in the efforts of peoples in Asia and elsewhere to escape, as we once escaped, the colonial system; and a foreign policy based on a realization that 1958 is not 1898, and on humanity and commonsense.

EMIL HENDRICKSON.

ASTORIA, OREG.

#### AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2058, Senate bill 4059, which was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4059) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, in order to change the name of the office established under such plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### HUMANE SLAUGHTERING—COOPERATION BY AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pleased yesterday to note that the American Meat Institute issued a press release relating to the passage in the Senate of the legislation known as the humane slaughtering practices legislation. That release was constructive and affirmative.

It appears that the American Meat Institute will seek to cooperate with the purposes of the legislation. It also issued a bulletin to all its members, which indicates the same constructive attitude.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a press statement issued by the American Meat Institute giving its reaction to the successful enactment of humane-slaughter legislation, plus a bulletin from the same organization to its members explaining the bill and commenting on the outcome of the legislative action.

I want the RECORD to show I am pleased at the reaction of the American Meat Institute. While this organization fought most vigorously against this legislation which I sponsored, it is accepting the mandate of Congress in good faith—and declaring its intent of going to work toward carrying out the objectives of the legislation. That is the right spirit. I repeat what I said during the debate—eventually, the entire meat industry will welcome and accept this move as a step forward, rather than repressive legislation.

I am convinced that if my colleagues who voted against this legislation, or

tried to block it, will read the statements to which I have referred they will now realize much of their professed fears were in vain.

Because I welcome the initial reaction of the American Meat Institute to this legislation, I want to voice my assurance that as long as such a cooperative spirit is shown toward making this legislation effective I am convinced the meat industry need not fear new drives for tighter or more restrictive legislation until we have had ample chance to see how this can work out. On the other hand, if there is evidence of deliberate foot dragging or attempts to evade the will of Congress, I am convinced that not even I could stop the demands of friends of humane treatment of animals from coming back to Congress with a new appeal for help.

Again I want to commend the meat industry for its favorable attitude now that it has lost fight to prevent this legislation from getting on the law books.

I ask unanimous consent to have the press release and the bulletin printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release and bulletin were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislation passed by the United States Senate will place the humane slaughter problems back in the hands of experienced experts where they belong, the American Meat Institute stated today.

"The meatpacking industry has always supported humane slaughter practices and has spent more time, money, and effort and come up with more progressive improvements to solve the difficult problems involved than has any other group," the institute said.

"While proponents of a number of legislative proposals have propagandized for humane slaughter laws, many of which have been well intentioned, without defining what is humane, meatpackers, in cooperation with some humane groups, have worked painstakingly at the job and have developed realistic practices that are now in use."

It is vital, according to the institute, that whatever means are devised that there be no interruption in the fast moving, highly efficient production lines of the industry.

"This is a necessary function that must be performed in order to keep a constant flow of 70 million pounds of meat moving steadily each day throughout the country," the institute explained.

Over 50 percent of the cattle are now being stunned with new and improved methods that meet humane standards the Government undoubtedly will approve, the institute reports. Progress in this field has been rapid since a new instrument was introduced a little over a year ago after a long testing period in plants of some of the companies.

"Meat packers welcome the opportunity to work with the special advisory committee which we understand the Secretary of Agriculture will appoint to help the industry develop and test constantly improving solutions to the problem," the institute said. "Such aid, we hope, may speed up progress in devising methods that will be practical with all classes of livestock in all sizes of plants."

[From American Meat Institute, Bulletin No. 99, of July 30, 1958]

#### HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILL PASSES SENATE

To the members:

The Senate yesterday passed an amended version of H. R. 8308, the bill to regulate

slaughtering methods of the meat packing industry. The amendments, which deal with effective dates and with ritual slaughtering, introduce into the bill variations between it and the bill passed by the House of Representatives, requiring that the legislation be referred to a conference committee unless the House agrees to the amendments. In any event, it is anticipated that the differences will be adjusted and that the bill will be enacted.

This culminates almost 5 years of effort on the part of the institute to avoid unrealistic and unworkable legislation in this area. While the bill is vague and contradictory, it does not stipulate a mandatory or completely unrealistic set of requirements such as some proposals on the subject have included. It does recognize the necessity for flexibility and places with the Secretary authority to make a determination as to what is and what is not legally humane.

Further, it does not carry criminal penalties such as some of these bills have done. It also provides for study and the application of the rule of reason in the matter of compliance. And it finally leaves with the packer the decision as to whether he will or will not adopt any particular methods, depending on his need or desire to sell livestock products to the Federal Government. It had been clear for some time that legislation on this subject was probably inevitable. The pressures exerted on Congress by humane societies has been tremendous, and the difficulty of getting the problem understood from the packers' standpoint has been a handicap. However, in spite of this, the bill now going to conference is a compromise between the extremes of mandatory slaughtering procedures and no legislation. Proper and reasonable administration could make it workable.

What the industry may expect under this bill is not certain. However, it may be helpful to members to analyze its provisions:

1. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that livestock slaughter and the handling of livestock in connection with slaughter be carried out only by humane methods.

2. Whether or not a particular method is humane may be determined by reference to different sections of the bill.

(a) One method declared to be humane is where "all animals are rendered insensible to pain by a single blow or gunshot or an electric, chemical, or other means that is rapid and effective, before being shackled, hoisted, thrown, cast, or cut."

(b) Another method declared to be humane is "slaughtering in accordance with the ritual requirements of the Jewish faith or any other religious faith that prescribes a method of slaughter whereby the animal suffers loss of consciousness by anemia of the brain caused by the simultaneous and instantaneous severance of the carotid arteries with a sharp instrument." One of the amendments adopted by the Senate would declare handling necessary in connection with ritual slaughtering to be humane.

(c) A third method for determining humane methods of slaughter would be by designation of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the Senate version of the bill, the Secretary would be required to designate such methods on or before March 1, 1959 (the date in the House bill was June 30, 1958). Additional methods could be designated later by giving notice in the Federal Register.

(d) It should be noted that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be required to limit his certification to those methods which would involve a single blow or gunshot, etc. It was made clear in the Congressional debates that the language specifying a single blow, etc., was intended to set forth specifically the techniques found by Congress to be humane, and at the same

time it was intended that the Secretary of Agriculture would designate other methods found by him to be humane. The bill does not prohibit the shackling of hogs, for example, and if the Secretary, after studying the matter, came to the conclusion that shackling was humane there appears to be nothing in the legislation to prevent him from designating it as acceptable under the public policy set forth. As a practical matter, the Secretary no doubt will be under considerable pressure from the humane organizations and it seems unrealistic to suppose that shackling as usually practiced will be designated as an approved method. However, the Secretary probably has it within his power to do so.

3. After June 30, 1960 (in the House bill the date was December 31, 1959), agencies of the Federal Government would be prohibited from procuring any livestock products from any slaughterer or processor which in any of his plants slaughters or handles livestock by any methods other than those designated as acceptable by the Secretary of Agriculture. This apparently would require packers wishing to sell to the Government to be in compliance in all of their plants on all species of livestock.

4. As aids to enforcement, packers selling to Federal agencies would be required to furnish statements of eligibility, with criminal penalties attaching for false statements. Also the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to provide a suitable means of identifying carcasses of animals passed by Federal inspection and slaughtered by approved methods.

5. During any national emergency declared by the President or Congress, the restrictions on Government procurement could be modified by the President to the extent necessary to meet essential procurement needs.

6. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed to conduct, assist, and foster research on methods of handling and slaughtering livestock. To assist him, he would be authorized to establish an advisory committee consisting of the following members:

(a) An officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, who would be chairman of the committee.

(b) Two representatives of national organizations of slaughterers.

(c) One representative of the trade-union movement engaged in packinghouse work.

(d) One representative of the general public.

(e) Two representatives of livestock growers.

(f) One representative of the poultry industry.

(g) Two representatives of national organizations of the humane movement.

(h) One representative of a national professional veterinary organization.

(i) One person familiar with the requirements of religious faiths with respect to slaughter.

7. In an amendment added by the Senate a complete exemption from the law would be extended to ritual slaughter and the handling or other preparation of livestock for ritual slaughter. This provision appears to be inconsistent with the provisions which declare ritual slaughter to be humane; however, there will be an opportunity for modification by any conference committee which may be appointed.

It may be observed that the Secretary of Agriculture is put in a rather difficult position by this bill. On one hand, he will be under pressure from humane organizations to designate certain methods as humane, or alternatively to designate certain methods as inhumane. On the other hand, he will be expected by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to administer the

law in such a way that the Government's meat supplies will not be cut off.

From the packer's standpoint, it may be noted that the only penalty which can be invoked is disqualification to sell livestock products to the Federal Government. So long as no misstatement is made in certifying eligibility, no criminal penalties will attach because certain slaughtering methods are used or because other slaughtering methods are not used.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,  
HOMER DAVISON, President.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY AND MARCUS BORCHARDT, WASHINGTON CIVIC LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the February 1958 issue of the News of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia. Headed, "Tribute Paid Neely and Borchardt," it mourns the loss of that distinguished Member of the Senate, Matthew M. Neely, who had so long befriended them as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, and of Marcus Borchardt who, as a Washington civic leader, had worked continuously for the good of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments and the well-being of the men who constitute these uniformed forces.

The editorial has an additional, a personal meaning for me, not only because I share in its sentiments, but also because the high regard expressed by Washington's policemen and firemen for Marcus Borchardt reveals a pattern of devoted public service closely parallel to that of his father, the late Maj. Newman Borchardt.

In the early pioneer days of Montana, Major Borchardt was chairman of the first board of commissioners for Custer County, which then comprised almost the entire eastern half of the State's area, and the first postmaster of Miles City, where his home was opened for the town's first religious services. Like father, like son. Both lived lives dedicated to service for their fellow men.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TRIBUTE PAID NEELY, BORCHARDT

Within 5 days last month the Policemen's Association lost 2 of its most ardent supporters and dearest friends. The death of Senator Matthew M. Neely, chairman of the Senate District Committee and "mayor" of Washington, will be a great loss to our association. His death on January 18 will be mourned jointly by law enforcement officers of West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

Five days later, Marcus Borchardt succumbed, a victim of pneumonia. A great civic leader, Mark as he was affectionately called, had more than a personal love and admiration for Washington's police and firemen. As chairman of the Public Protection Committee of the Washington Board of Trade, Mark not only understood with a sympathetic heart the many problems confronting the men in blue, but he worked consistently to find the solutions. Our heartfelt sympathy to their families.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 1, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 495. An act to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; and

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A. M. MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, August 4, 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1958:

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1965.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 34: 3: *O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name together. Almighty God, Thou art our help in each new day and our hope for every unknown tomorrow.*

We humbly confess that to turn away from Thee is to fall but to abide in Thee is to stand fast forever.

May Thy truth be our shield and Thy presence our strength as we daily seek to walk in the way of Thy wise and holy commandments.

Inspire men and nations everywhere with a greater loyalty and devotion to the ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained for the peace and prosperity of the world.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4640. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to payments from voluntary contributions accounts; and